DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 086 SP 039 527

AUTHOR	Lauter, Nancy J., Ed.
TITLE	Professional Development Schools: Confronting Realities.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, NY. Teachers Coll. National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, MO.; Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	182p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, Box 110, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027; Tel: 212-678-3432; Fax: 212-678-4170; Web site: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/~ncrest.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; *College School Cooperation; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Faculty Development; Financial Support; Higher Education; Inquiry; *Partnerships in Education; Politics of Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Institutionalization (of Goals); Institutionalization (of Innovations)

ABSTRACT

This collection of articles discusses the realities of Professional Development Schools (PDS) from the perspectives of school teachers, college faculty, college administrators, and other educational administrators. The articles focus on the five dimensions of PDS work (institutionalization, equity, standards and quality, inquiry, and financing). They include: "Introduction" (Nancy J. Lauter); "Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Successes, Challenges, and Continuing Tensions" (Lee Teitel, Charlotte Reed, Karen O'Connor, with Katherine Boles, Nancy J. Lauter, Vivian Troen, and Robert O. Williams); "The Cultural and Community Politics of Educational Equity: Toward a New Framework of Professional Development Schools" (Peter C. Murrell, Jr. and Mario Borunda); "Setting Standards for Professional Development Schools" (Jon Snyder, Betty Lou Whitford, and Robert O. Williams); "Inquiry and Professional Development Schools" (Barnett Berry, Katherine Boles, with Kellah Edens, Annalee Nissenholtz, and Roberta Trachtman); and "Financing Professional Development Schools" (Richard W. Clark). (Most articles contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 446 086

Professional Development Schools

Confronting Realities

Edited by Nancy J. Lauter

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN
MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039527

NCREST

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Professional Development Schools: Confronting Realities

edited by Nancy J. Lauter

Copyright © 1998 by The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST).

Co-Directors: Linda Darling-Hammond, Gary A. Griffin, and Ann Lieberman

The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) was created to document, support, connect, and make lasting the many restructuring efforts going on throughout the nation. NCREST's work builds concrete, detailed knowledge about the intense and difficult efforts undertaken in restructuring schools. This knowledge is used to help others in their attempts at change, to begin to build future education programs for school practitioners, and to promote the policy changes that will nurture and encourage needed structural reforms. The Center brings together many voices: those of practitioners and researchers, parents and students, policymakers and teacher educators.

NCREST has been supported by a major grant from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund. NCREST's work in New York City, through its Center for School Reform, has been supported by the Aaron Diamond Foundation and the Leon Lowenstein Foundation. Funding for individual projects has also been provided by the Annenberg Foundation • the AT&T Foundation • the BellSouth Foundation • Carnegie Corporation of New York • the Center for Applied Linguistics • the Center for Collaborative Education • the Corporation for Public Broadcasting • the Danforth Foundation • the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation • the Ford Foundation • the Fund for New York City Public Education • Impact II • the Kauffman Foundation • the William R. Kenan Jr. Charitable Trust • the Lilly Endowment, Inc. • the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation • the Joyce Foundation • the Metropolitan Life Foundation • the National Center for Research on Vocational Education • the New York Community Trust • the New York State Education Department • the Pew Charitable Trusts • the Philip Morris Companies Inc. • the Policy Studies Association • the Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands • the Rockefeller Foundation • the Spencer Foundation • the U.S. Department of Education • and the William Penn Foundation.

To purchase additional copies, please contact:

NCREST

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION, SCHOOLS, AND TEACHING

Box 110

Teachers College, Columbia University

New York, NY 10027

(212) 678-3432 phone **(212) 678-4170 fax**

http://www.tc.columbia.edu/~ncrest

Professional Development Schools:

Confronting Realities

Professional Development Schools:

Confronting Realities

Edited by Nancy J. Lauter

Funding for this project was made possible
by The Danforth Foundation and The Pew Charitable Trusts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments viii

Introduction ix
Nancy J. Lauter

The Collection

Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Successes, Challenges, and Continuing Tensions 1
Lee Teitel, Charlotte Reed, and Karen O'Connor
with Katherine Boles, Nancy J. Lauter, Vivian Troen, and Robert O.Williams

The Cultural and Community Politics of Educational Equity: Toward a New Framework of Professional Development Schools 65
Peter C. Murrell, Jr. and Mario Borunda

Setting Standards for Professional Development Schools 87
Jon Snyder, Betty Lou Whitford, and Robert O. Williams

Inquiry and Professional Development Schools 121
Barnett Berry and Katherine Boles
with Kellah Edens, Annalee Nissenholtz, and Roberta Trachtman

Financing Professional Development Schools 149
Richard W. Clark

About the Authors 167

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, thanks go to all the individuals who work day to day and year to year in the vineyards of professional development schools: those who lovingly snip and pinch the unyielding vines to stimulate growth in new directions.

Each of the Co-directors of the National Center for Education, Schools, and Teaching, Linda Darling-Hammond, Ann Lieberman, and Gary A. Griffin, have been tremendously supportive and patient with this document. Gary's comments on each article were helpful and confirming. In addition, I express my sincere appreciation to my former colleague at NCREST, Velma Cobb. Velma supported and led this work "before the beginning."

I want to thank each of the authors of the articles for their thoughtful work and enduring sense of humor during the long and arduous process of editing and rewriting. In particular, I am indebted to the lead authors—Lee Teitel, Charlotte Reed, Karen O'Connor, Peter Murrell, Mario Borunda, Betty Lou Whitford, Jon Snyder, Bob Williams, Barnett Berry, Katherine Boles, and Dick Clark. The thoughtful and challenging comments of our outside reviewers helped us to set clear directions and share our thoughts more clearly with the reader.

Of course, there are always people on a project like this who appear to be behind-the-scenes, but are in-fact those who make it happen. In this case Patrice Litman at NCREST is that person, and I offer her sincere thanks for her commitment and persistence in seeing this project through. Thanks also to our graphics editor Jessica McKenzie.

Finally, all of us would like to thank Peter Wilson and The Danforth Foundation for their support of the NCREST PDS Network and The Pew Charitable Trusts for its continuing support. This collection of papers will serve as documentation of the energetic and provoking dialogue that grew out of the Network's meetings.

INTRODUCTION

Nancy J. Lauter

GROWING UP AN IDEA

Professional development schools bring together strands of our education system that have to date been artificially separated: preparation of new teachers, professional development of teachers and teacher educators, inquiry of school-based practice, and efforts to support higher achievement of all our children. Creating a professional development school means reshaping the cultures of public schools, schools of education, teacher unions, and their extended communities. This process is analogous to molding a lump of clay **after** it has dried and hardened to a solid mass. It is not impossible, but it is hard work and takes time for the clay to reconstitute itself into a malleable medium.

In order to survive, PDSs must achieve consensus on shared values and beliefs, walk on both sides of the school and university dividing lines, invent new practices and new roles, and reallocate human and financial resources. Inventing a "new" institution is a task that requires a new knowledge base, a support community, and a collective confidence which enables risk-taking.

In 1992, the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) led by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman began a conversation with colleagues from around the nation about how to support the growth and development of professional development schools. Although PDSs were beginning to dot the landscape in increasing numbers, most of them were struggling in isolation. There were few formal mechanisms to link PDSs (exceptions were the National Network for Educational Renewal, the Michigan Partnership, and The Holmes Group) or to document what was being learned from the evolving partnerships. With funding from the Danforth Foundation, the Professional Development Schools Network was created to connect PDSs to one another, document developing models and practices in order to build a knowledge base, disseminate promising practices, and develop policy proposals and professional actions that would help institutionalize PDS work.

Since our work began the number of partnerships has increased significantly, from an early estimate of less than 200 to over 600 partnership sites (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). PDSs are cited in the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future Report, What Matters Most (1996), as a key component of the blueprint for our education system in the next century. Much has been written about the concept and rationale of PDSs or partner schools (Goodlad, 1990; The Holmes Group, 1986, 1990, 1995; Levine, 1992; Osguthorpe, Harris, Harris, and Black, 1995); the current and evolving practices that are becoming part of the PDS culture (Petrie, 1995; Teitel, 1996; Levine and Trachtman, 1997); and models of PDSs along the continuum from beginning ideas to implementation and maturity have been described and analyzed (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Yet as many PDSs move into a "beyond infancy" stage, basic questions continue to be raised concerning what characteristics define a PDS, how will PDSs be supported and sustained over the long haul, and how will we know if and when PDS strategies are making a difference in increasing student achievement?

The core group of the Network developed a Vision Statement for professional development schools (NCREST, 1993), compiled case studies of PDS partnerships (Darling-Hammond, 1994), and disseminated the PDS Network News as a forum for sharing substantive PDS issues. Most recently the core group established workgroups to focus on recurring challenges of partnerships: institutionalization, equity, standards and quality, inquiry, and finance.

The PDS Network workgroups met over time to raise questions, wrestle with how we know what we know about PDS work, and reflect on what needs to happen or change if PDSs are to "hold the vision" and move from the margins to the center of our educational systems. This collection of papers is the culmination of our questioning and reflecting. Many questions remain unresolved. Many new questions seek more information and documentation. But, we made progress in more carefully identifying what the important questions are and how we can go about finding possible solutions. Our dialogues led us to focus on:

x

- characteristics and conditions of institutionalization,
- how equity is embedded in PDS work,
- questions and concerns regarding "cookie-cutter syndrome" raised by the possibility of using formal standards to measure the quality of PDSs,
- new systems of inquiry emerging from PDS partnerships that cannot be defined under the rubrics of traditional research, and
- the urgent need to identify and reallocate human and financial resources in order to sustain PDSs.

FIVE DIMENSIONS OF PDS WORK

Institutionalization

The first paper by Lee Teitel, Charlotte Reed, and Karen O'Connor focuses on institutionalizing professional development schools: where do PDSs exist on the landscape of partner institutions? If we cannot weave PDS work into the day-to-day fabric of public schools and teacher education programs, PDSs will remain on the margins, vulnerable, and most likely, impossible to sustain. The authors identify seven signs of institutionalization at the outset of the paper, and then offer the reader stories of seven different partnerships. The most revealing characteristic of each partnership is where it sits along the continuum of marginalization and institutionalization. Marginalized programs only touch a fraction of children, teacher education candidates, school and college-based faculty; and work with a small portion of schools within a district and programs at the university. These are generally "stand-alone" programs which are set apart from traditional teacher preparation. A marginalized program may be given license to experiment and implement innovative practices, but if the program is set apart from the mainstream of life in schools and the university it is outside the *status quo* and therefore, not institutionally valid. Schools and universities which are closer to institutionalizing PDSs have restructured their teacher preparation programs and reallocated human and financial resources to support PDS work.

Most PDSs, as revealed through the profiles of several different partnerships, began on the margins of teacher education programs and remain there. And yet, much has been learned about strategies that can tie the threads of change into the core of institutions. Charlotte Reed describes the Urban Teacher Education Program (UTEP) at University of Indiana Northwest which began as a program funded by the Lilly Foundation and separate from the mainstream teacher education courses. By the end of the funding cycle the UTEP had built a powerful coalition of school- and college-based faculty, students, and administrators who saw the benefits of joining the resources of schools and colleges. But when the foundation funding ran out, there were no permanent resources allocated to this work. The Teachers College/Manhattan District Three/United Federation of Teachers Partnership also struggles to survive after initial funds disappeared. Similar to UTEP's story this New York partnership manages to continue by gaining support, financial resources in particular, from the academic dean, the superintendent of District Three, and new external funding. Yet, none of the PDS funding occupies a permanent budget line in any institution. In addition, members of the partnership wrestle with the constraints of heavy workloads and inflexible schedules, reward systems that do not acknowledge PDS work, lack of support from some colleagues, and the conflicting dispositions of insecurity and hope.

The grassroots efforts of the Learning/Teaching Collaborative, as told by Vivian Troen and Katherine Boles, is a dramatic story. Rather than the initial impetus and funding coming from the university or a foundation, the spark that ignited this partnership came from Troen and Boles, two long-time classroom teachers. Modeling the role of teacher as change agent, Troen and Boles educated their community, sought funds, wrote articles for national dissemination, formed partnerships with two colleges, and convinced school administrators that these changes would enhance children's and teachers' learning. Troen and Boles "created the moment" to work toward building partnerships. At Indiana State, PDS advocates grabbed a moment that was created by necessity. A long-term revision of the teacher preparation program articulated the role of the teacher to include collaborator, researcher, and mentor and underscored the necessity of building partnerships with schools. At the same time, the university decided to close the campus laboratory school, which left a permanent funding line available for reallocation. Strong support by the dean, university administrators, and schools which were willing to work with the university on restructuring enabled an intensive and thoughtful planning and implementation process. The agreement between schools and university asked the schools to commit 50% of their professional development funds to PDS efforts, and required the university to promote professional development through funding for school-based research and teacher access to university courses and resources. The preservice program at Indiana State is embedded in this partnership. Although vulnerabilities remain, the move from the margins to the center is well underway.

Finally, Lee Teitel shares longitudinal and comparative data from a five-year update of three partnerships in Massachusetts. One faculty member from a partner site describes institutionalizing PDS as building a web of strong relationships. The web must be so strong that if a key PDS participant decides to leave the web will not collapse. One partnership experienced the strains of successorship. In this case, the web was held together by a group of teachers who had completed this college's teacher education program and had completed their PDS internships in their present school. They were not willing to see the partnership fade away. Continuity and the commitment of a critical mass of people are powerful factors in sustaining change.

Each profile offers a unique look at the compromises and commitments university and school districts have made in order to invent new roles, reallocate financial resources, and dramatically alter the way relationships work. At the conclusion of the paper, the authors discuss the partnerships with regard to the seven signs of institutionalization.

Equity

"Cultural and Community Politics of Educational Equity" by Peter Murrell, Jr. and Mario Borunda holds a mirror up to the stated vision of equity in PDSs and asks "is the current reality what we want?" Educators talk a lot about equity, but few take the time to thoughtfully reflect on how to eliminate layers of bureaucracy which are infiltrated with inequitable processes and dispositions. A plan to truly reconfigure how power and access are portioned out in our PDSs has not been fully addressed. Murrell and Borunda present a provocative, powerful, and convincing argument which "requires interrogation of the PDS idea in order to rupture the hegemony of the model" (Murrell and Borunda, 1998, p. 71). To focus on equity as the need for more access to educational opportunities ". . .narrows the equity agenda to concerns that fall far short of addressing the roots of educational inequality" (p. 70). The authors identify nine factors which they would expect to find in a equity-minded professional development school, and push us to question whether these features should and/or do exist in our partnerships. This thought-provoking essay asks difficult questions, and offers possible new approaches to issues of equity.

Standards and Quality

The questions are clear: "why standards?, what kind of standards?, for what purposes?"; but the answers are not. This essay reflects the thoughts and dispositions of three partnerships, based respectively in Terre Haute, Indiana; Santa Barbara, California; and Louisville, Kentucky willing to begin a dialogue on whether national standards are necessary and/or appropriate for PDSs at this point in time. Standards, given that they support and facilitate quality practices, appear to be a good idea until we consider how they might impact the idiosyncratic evolution of PDSs. The best standards, if it is possible to define them, may promote and sustain PDS practices, but they may also constrain and re-direct the existing independent, culturally responsive growth of most partnerships. The necessary struggle to weigh the proposed quality outcomes (support for those doing the work) against the very real possibility that standards will bring limitations and the imposition of an outsider's perspective (control those doing the work) is the dialogue reflected in this article.

The questions raised, as well as the inquiry process, are particularly pertinent given the development of National PDS Standards by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Is it time for PDSs to abide by standard--or are most PDSs too young and too fragile? Will it be possible for PDS standards to hold the vision as it is locally defined, and at the same time outline conditions and processes necessary for the success and sustainability of professional development schools?

Inquiry

Who asks questions, which questions are asked, and how they are answered is changing in the field of education. The gap between theory and practice or practice and theory is being addressed by teachers who are willing to tell their stories and ask the questions that make sense to them in their particular settings. For many decades, theory has not had a dialogue with practice and researchers have not been able to answer most of the questions classroom practitioners need to have answered. However, the tremendous growth in the concept and the reality of teachers as researchers (e.g., Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1993; Hubbard and Power, 1993), has broadened our responses to the who, what, and how of educational research. As a learning community, we are poised to re-think and redefine the nature of educational research.

Based on evolving methods of inquiry regarding teaching and learning, Barnett Berry, Kitty Boles, and their colleagues share a new framework which defines three types of inquiry related to practice: inquiry as a means to improve teaching and learning, inquiry in practices of learning (e.g., case studies, action research projects, authentic assessment, and curriculum design), and inquiry on the effects of professional development schools. The first step in reconfiguring how we come to understand student and teacher learning is to examine the current definition of inquiry. What is contributed to the knowledge base and by whom? New definitions of inquiry may need to value both standardized and idiosyncratic, context-bound questions; quantitative and variable qualitative methods; publication in professional journals and dissemination to colleagues and a public audience through conferences and on-line listservs. The nature of PDSs demands that if we are to be communities of inquiry, we must expand our definitions to include all stakeholders. Partnerships, such as PDSs, will redefine how a knowledge base is constructed.

Financing

There is little disagreement that professional development schools need supportive policies and permanent funding streams in order to sustain themselves. In too many cases, PDSs exist on precarious outside funding (or often just the vapors of previous funding) and the good will and dedication of committed participants and institutional "favors." We have begun to fill the PDS house with collaborative relationships, successful practices, and new methods of inquiry; but we have not yet secured the primary structures that hold the house together. Policies and funding that will support the development and long-time operation of PDSs must be found and implemented. The efforts of a few states (Texas and Missouri) and the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) are providing models to states to implement PDS-friendly policies.

As Richard Clark delineates in his article, there is a multitude of factors to consider when making a case for the cost benefits of PDSs. Regardless of how the factors play out, the majority of PDS funding must come from the institutions involved. Current funding must be reallocated and new policies must encourage and support the work of partnerships. For example, colleges, school districts, and teacher associations are all involved at some level with professional development. Would it be possible to develop a shared mission and consolidate these efforts by revising how and where funds are allocated?

Next Steps

Across the country, PDSs have developed models of partnership among schools, universities/colleges, and their extended communities. Some of these models have moved towards deep structural changes which demonstrate a shift of power from university-owned knowledge to recognition of the valuable knowledge generated at school sites. Some teachers and teacher educators have been empowered to take on new roles and to span the boundaries between theory and practice. Some institutions have chosen to put partnerships at the center of their work and have reallocated resources in order to sustain new relationships over time. However, many have not found the practical or ideological means to dramatically change schools and schools of education.

Each of the dimensions described in this collection anticipates the development of new structures to support and sustain PDSs. As we move into a period which must demonstrate long-term viability of PDSs; broader structures at the state and federal levels must encapsulate the new roles, programs, and "ways of working" that are defining PDSs. The hard work of individuals is necessary (as always), but no longer sufficient to sustain PDS partnerships. Partnerships must continue after their hardiest advocates have moved on.

At the same time, we must accept and demonstrate that PDSs are dynamic and continuously evolving institutions. Critical interrogation of the planned vision is part of the process of being a PDS. Are we creating the reality that truly responds to our goals for all children? The following articles push the questions, broaden the debate, and offer new directions for investigation and reflection.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1993). Inside/Outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco, CA. Jossey-Bass.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hubbard R.S. & Power, B.M. (1993). The art of classroom inquiry. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Levine, M. (Ed.). (1992). Professional practice schools. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Levine, M. & Trachtman, R. (Eds.). (1997). Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice, and policy. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murrell, P., Jr. and Borunda, M. (1998). The cultural and community politics of educational equity. In N. Lauter (Ed.), Professional Development Schools: Confronting realities. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

National Center for Restructuring Education, School, and Teaching. (1993). Vision statement: Purposes, commitments, and enabling conditions for professional development schools. PDS Network News, 1 (1), pp. 3-6.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). What matters most. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Osguthorpe, R.T., Harris, R.C., Harris, M.F., & Black, S. (Eds.). (1995). Partner schools: Centers for educational renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petrie, H.G. (Ed.) (1995). Professionalism, partnership, and power: Building professional development schools. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development schools: A literature review. Washington DC: Unpublished manuscript, NCATE.

Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Successes, Challenges, and Continuing Tensions

Lee Teitel, Charlotte Reed, and Karen O'Connor
with Katherine Boles, Nancy J. Lauter,
Vivian Troen, and Robert O. Williams

WHAT DOES "INSTITUTIONALIZATION" MEAN?

Professional development schools can be said to be institutionalized when they become the accepted way of doing business in the schools and colleges or universities that constitute them. Beyond this broad statement, institutionalization needs to be understood in context. The processes of institutionalization of PDSs will be different in a research university than in a small liberal arts college, or in a small suburban school district as opposed to a large urban one. The PDS profiles that form the core of this chapter provide clear examples of how organizational context affects the growth, maintenance, and stability of professional development schools in different settings. Nonetheless, there are some common definitions or signs of institutionalization that seem to work across a range of settings. They are offered below to provide a useful framework for reading the profiles. Institutionalization of PDSs can be seen to be taking place when:

- The PDS is integral to the partnership and to the operation of both the school and the college or university; the PDS is used in job descriptions, course catalogs, integrated into the core values, culture, and attitudes and, in general, is woven into the fabric of participating institutions.
- A critical mass of persons from participating institutions, including those with leadership and authority, is involved in the PDS.
- A governance structure is present that engages the voices of faculty members and other staff and administrators in ways that allow for ownership, continuity, communication, vitality, and commitment.
- Adequate resources are available at participating institutions, including a budget line and a schedule that permits staffs from the respective institutions to focus on issues and work pertaining to the PDS during their regular workday.
- Professional development regularly takes place that acknowledges new roles for all the professionals involved in a PDS (pre- and inservice teachers as well as other professionals—counselors, administrators, etc.) at the school and the college; and is conducted in a mutually beneficial and reciprocal way through the PDS.

- The reward system at participating institutions, including salary, incentives, promotion, and tenure, reflects the importance of PDS work.
- Assessment processes provide for ongoing inquiry in and on the PDS to ensure that institutionalization not only leads to new structures and policies that appear to be innovative, but ones that actually improve the learning of students and teachers; assessment processes need to incorporate follow-up procedures that make sure the PDS is meeting the original or evolving mission and goals for the partnership. Assessment is also key to locating and sustaining stable funding and support from outside funders and from decision makers at the district and college levels.

METHODOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION

This chapter grew out of the efforts of a workgroup on PDS institutionalization established in January 1995 by the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching (NCREST). Drawing on data from PDS partnerships involving, in total, seven colleges or universities and more than 50 schools, members of the workgroup wrote profiles that provide a rich and varied view of what institutionalization means in different settings and what steps PDS advocates can take to ensure that the PDS is not just a short-term, passing project. Initially guided by a common set of questions (see Appendix A), the profiles ended up varying substantially as the authors proceeded to get answers to the questions in different ways, suited to their respective time constraints, access to information, and individual organizational contexts. Information was gathered from colleagues and PDS participants through some combination of surveys, partnership meetings, interviews, and personal reflections on the guiding questions. Each profile begins with a start-up history that outlines the broader context, includes a section on what signs (if any) of institutionalization are present, and concludes with reflections and an outline of next steps. A concluding, integrative section revisits the seven signs of institutionalization outlined here and considers the challenges and continuing tensions related to reaching institutionalization goals that show up across all settings.

PROFILES OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF PDSs

The Urban Teacher Education Program at Indiana University Northwest

Summary

In her paper on the Urban Teacher Education Program at Indiana University Northwest, Charlotte Reed describes the institutionalization challenges facing a PDS partnership making the transition to local sponsorship after eight years of grant funding. This involves getting and sustaining financial contributions from the university and districts, as well as adjusting to what will inevitably be lower levels of funding. Reed emphasizes the importance of making clear to participating institutions what the benefits of collaboration are, making changes in gover-

nance structure, and trying to involve more university faculty in collaborative work with the schools.

Start-up History and Context

The professional development effort at Indiana University Northwest (IUN) started within an experimental program to prepare urban teachers. The Urban Teacher Education Program (UTEP) is a collaborative among three urban school districts and the university for the preparation and professional development of urban teachers. Members of the collaborative include: East Chicago Public Schools and East Chicago Federation of Teachers; Gary Community School Corporation and Gary Teachers' Union; School City of Hammond and Hammond Teachers' Federation; and Indiana University Northwest. Program funding was provided by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., the three urban districts, and the university. The Lilly portion of the funding ended in June of 1996.

UTEP is designed to substantially change the way teachers are prepared and to accomplish several related goals, such as to recruit more minority students to become teachers and role models in urban schools; to increase teacher, parent, and community participation in teacher preparation; and to create professional development schools as exemplary urban centers of teaching and learning. UTEP offers both undergraduate and graduate routes to certification, depending on the preparation and certification needs of the student.

UTEP altered the concept of PDSs somewhat and developed what it called PDCs or professional development centers, which were located in selected schools within the urban districts and only involved a small portion of each faculty. Each site had a peer-selected full-time coordinator. The unions were instrumental in the selection of teacher instructors (TIs) for each site. Under the PDC concept, no site has had more than 12 active TIs paid by the grant in a given year. We have used other faculty members to serve as associate TIs to handle the overflow, especially when a particular PDC has had more students than the contracted TIs could handle effectively. In the course of the program's eight-year history:

- The program has moved from the PDC concept to the broader, more inclusive model of PDSs.
- There have been six sites: two high schools, three elementary schools and one middle school; and there have been seven PDC/PDS coordinators: three elementary, two middle, and two high school.
- The role of coordinator has continued to evolve from a full-time grant-supported position to a part-time position supported primarily by the districts. It continues to be a multifaceted role within the collaborative, including, but not limited to, providing leadership and coordination at the site. Coordinators have served on the core staff and as adjunct faculty members at the university.

- Approximately 65 TIs have selected to participate in the program and have received professional development to prepare them to be effective coaches to preservice urban teachers. Many of the TIs were leaders in their buildings or have emerged as leaders in their district—receiving teaching awards, promotions, and other forms of recognition.
- In addition to the TIs with whom we have formal contracts, more than 70 teachers have worked with our students in the capacity of associate TIs. These teachers have become vital to the functioning of the program, providing a larger pool of educators for field placements. Associate TIs and other district teachers have been invited to participate in professional development activities sponsored by the program.
- Six of the content-methods professors have collaborated with TIs on the preparation of syllabi, and at least three have taught their methods course on site. The on-site teaching occurred most effectively in the first elementary PDC, where TIs supplemented course seminars with special seminars on topics such as grading, conferencing with parents, and classroom management. TIs have continued to offer some special seminars for the students, even though the courses are no longer taught on site.
- The PDCs/PDSs have worked with more than 180 general-methods students in addition to all of the undergraduates and conventional graduate students in UTEP, providing them with an exposure to urban schools and opportunities to work with urban students in various capacities. We have instituted the use of overflow sites in the urban districts to ease the burden at the PDSs.
- UTEP graduates have approximated or exceeded the academic performance of other division graduates. Some UTEP students have graduated with honors and have received state and local recognition.
- The program has prepared more than 80 urban teachers, and the urban districts have hired the majority of them. Many of our graduates have emerged as leaders in their buildings, and some have served as mentors and TIs for other UTEP students.

Signs of Institutional Change at IUN and in the Districts

The administration at IUN has given strong support to the use of professional development centers/schools as an approach to the delivery of teacher education, while admittedly being concerned about expense and labor intensity. In 1994, the dean added two core staff members to the academic coordinators' group that met regularly during the year to discuss future directions of the Division of Education. In fall 1995, the acting dean and UTEP director initiated talks with the urban districts to see how the partnership could keep functioning without Lilly dollars. Each district indicated a strong interest in continuing the partnership with the university. The university made a significant commitment to institutionalizing PDSs by funding two full-time tenure-track positions and a clerical support person dedicated to the urban collaborative. IUN set aside a pool of money to support an urban PDS office, PDS block grants, mentor fees, student stipends, and professional development. Two of the districts picked up the part-time salary of the coordinator out of their own funds, while the third district funded the part-time coordinator out of its block grant from IUN. Each PDS has a specific space set aside for UTEP. One district continues to fund a part-time secretary to staff its UTEP office. (Although she is employed full-time, only a portion of her day is dedicated to UTEP.)

Another positive indication of institutional support: IUN is giving faculty release time to work intensively in the schools in a "faculty-in-residence" capacity. The idea is to move beyond one-shot approaches to addressing the needs of schools and to allow professors to really get to know a school, its faculty, students, and parents. In this way, services will be more tailored to the school and its special context. In terms of curriculum, the general-methods course has been revamped to include specific urban content and an urban field placement both for elementary and for secondary students. Because only a limited number of students can be accommodated at the PDS without disrupting its day-to-day functioning, we have added urban overflow sites, which were carefully selected by each superintendent. The number of elementary and secondary special-methods courses offered at the urban PDSs has been reduced to avoid teacher burnout. These courses will focus on areas of shortage and critical need within the districts, such as math, science, and special education. We believe that the program should be responsive to those needs. It would also give our students a better chance of being hired after graduation.

In the districts, the delivery of the curriculum has been affected by the professional development component of UTEP. The professional development initiatives of UTEP have often become a part of the development plan for the entire school. This is particularly significant because our program initially made use of the professional development center approach, involving only a small portion of a school's faculty. We have seen a ripple effect. Some of the teachers involved in the program have acted as catalysts for change in their buildings. The coordinators have each taken a leadership role in the professional development activities of their schools.

Related to this is the TIs increased concern for and involvement in the professional development of novice teachers. The TIs exhibit ownership in what the novices become—wanting the novices to be good teachers, while ensuring that their students are not exposed to poor teaching. Students are more sensitive to their own teaching and want to model best practice. Some of the TIs engage in peer coaching and participate in a reflective process with IUN students to help them become reflective teachers.

The PDCs consistently have used more teachers than those who actually signed contracts. The number of associate TIs has steadily increased. Moving to full PDSs has allowed more faculty to participate in a planned manner without the need to differentiate their titles or duties. Also, by awarding a stipend to the PDS rather than to individual teachers, we have reduced friction, created equity, and encouraged more participation within the school and more schoolwide ownership of the program.

The collaborative now functions with an advisory board and an individualized contract between the university and the urban districts, rather than with the policy board structure that was in place under the Lilly grant. The advisory board consists of teachers and professors who are engaged in the delivery of the program. In order to keep central administrations informed and supportive, the advisory board meets semi-annually with the superintendents, chancellor, dean of education, fiscal officers, and union representatives to assess the program, plan its next stage, and appropriate funds.

As stated earlier, the districts fund certain aspects of the program, so that we can continue to operate the PDSs without Lilly dollars. The districts provide money for a part-time coordinator and clerical support. Each district determined the amount of support it needed and/or could afford and fashioned the position as half-time or less. The collaborative agreed that it would be acceptable to fund the PDS instead of individual teachers, especially because the university could in no way match the generous stipends offered under Lilly. The stipends were the source of some discontent among other teachers who accepted non-UTEP students but received no such stipends. This time around, the PDSs determined how to spend their block grant. The PDSs paid stipends to teachers and in one case paid the coordinator's salary from their grant.

We have worked more collaboratively with the districts in order to meet their professional development needs. We have talked with one district about designing a flexible master's degree program in which 12 hours could be devoted to courses specifically designed to address areas of interest to districts and their teachers. Because master's degrees are no longer required in Indiana, teachers could take all or some of the hours, depending on their educational plans. Another district is implementing the Accelerated Schools Model; and in addition to the professional development activities called for in its grant, this district will probably want to document its efforts and the program's impact on the achievement of students in the designated schools. One of the full-time urban faculty members will be working very closely with this effort and serving as a coach. These schools are being seen as possible future PDS sites. Last, we have initiated a career-ladder program with one of the districts in an attempt to eliminate the large number of individuals who are teaching on what is known as a "limited license" and to increase the number of regularly licensed teachers in the district. People who have been accepted in the program currently are pursuing one of two options as a route to certification.

Reflections/Next Steps

The process of real change originates with the leadership of one or more people who share a vision. Usually they feel very passionately about that vision and are able to enlist others in sharing this passion. Some would describe their behavior as almost charismatic. They have the ability to see beyond all the negative "what ifs" to the positive "why nots" and create an expectancy of success. By enlisting others in their passion and expectancy of success, these leaders are able to energize and mobilize people and resources to accomplish what seems to be the impossible.

First, I believe that there are people in the collaborative who share the vision of what UTEP could become. They are enthusiastic about actualizing that vision and influencing significantly how we prepare teachers in the Division of Education. But there are others who feel that PDSs are too labor intensive and expensive, putting an unnecessary burden on both the schools and the university. I firmly believe that the rewards of this model far outweigh the challenges. If we are willing to spend thousands and thousands of dollars on practices that we know are not effective with urban children or children in poverty, then it seems we can invest a small percentage of those dollars to restructure education and teacher education to reach those same populations.

This is what I wish we would do for the sake of urban children:

- Collaborate with urban teachers to develop competencies that answer more clearly what dispositions (values and attitudes) we want IUN students to carry with them in addition to what we want them to know and do when they finish the program.
- Collaborate with urban teachers to design performance assessments that clearly demonstrate that our students have mastered those competencies with urban children.
- Teach and assess those competencies by infusing urban and multicultural content and resources in each methods course.
- Commit to teaching methods courses at the PDSs, using UTEP's notion of instructional teams to co-plan the course syllabi with the appropriate TIs.
- Engage university faculty in their own professional development as well as that of teachers.
- Co-teach with school-based faculty.
- Use reflection techniques with field students and student teachers.
- Develop intensive partnerships with PDSs and focus on their school improvement goals.

This vision could be actualized if a support system or network was put in place to change personnel, policies, practices, procedures, and processes as needed. In this particular case, that would mean enlisting the aid of several Division of Education committees; the dean, individual faculty, and staff members; and university committees as well as parallel structures and people in the school districts. Some suggested changes include:

- The dean assigning more faculty to work in PDSs, particularly our urban PDSs and reassigning time to provide opportunities for collaboration with school-based faculty;
- The evaluation and reward committee proposing a plan that makes it impossible to get an excellent rating without substantial work in the schools, including teaching, service and/or research. Giving incentive points toward merit pay for engaging in instructional teams and collaboratively designing courses, doing cognitive coaching, co-teaching with school-based faculty, and developing grants to improve instruction in K-12 schools;
- The curriculum committee proposing a course load that would give professors load credit and responsibility for the field component of methods courses they teach;
- The university planning and assessment committee presenting a plan to the faculty that links course and field work assessment to abilities that are perceived as exemplary practice both by researchers and by practitioners; and
- The division instituting hiring practices that give preference to those who are willing and competent in working collaboratively with schools, particularly PDSs. This should also apply as we seek to fill the position of dean of the Division of Education.

Some measures have already been put in place to move us forward in the institutionalization of PDSs. The UTEP director developed surveys to ascertain what the chancellor, acting dean, and superintendents were willing to commit after the grant funding ended. Representatives of central administration, the PDCs, and the union met formally and/or informally to discuss what was feasible for each district. A similar process occurred at the university among representatives of central administration, the Division of Education, and the UTEP core staff.

Using data from earlier planning meetings and the surveys of both the university and the urban districts, some agreements were identified. Generally, there is a unified commitment to continue operating urban PDSs and a shared commitment to jointly fund their operation, as well as a consensus that the purpose of the PDSs will be to collaboratively prepare urban teachers and to improve the quality of instruction in the PDSs through professional development. Other more specific agreements shared at the policy board meeting stated that:

- The university will continue to support the Division of Education's urban initiative through the state funds that currently support UTEP. Beyond the two tenure-track positions and clerical support, there will be approximately $37,000 to fund an office, PDS stipends, student support, and professional development activities;

- The Division of Education will assign a person to coordinate the urban PDS initiative at the university. It will be a part of the load of one of the full-time urban faculty positions; and
- The urban districts will continue to have at least one active PDS in each city and fund at least a part-time PDS coordinator or lead teacher with some clerical support.

The present phase is the most difficult one, because now we are operating PDSs on far less money than we had when the PDSs were funded by the Lilly grant. We are trying to do all of the work with a much smaller portion of the money. As mentioned before, we have a new governance structure that is more balanced and representative of those involved in the actual delivery of the program. Some of the mistakes made in the formative stages of this collaborative still haunt us and hinder some partners' ability to fully trust the process. Nevertheless, we have moved from being a policymaking body to being an advisory body. We have the added security of a contractual agreement which stipulates that an annual meeting will be held for planning and assessment purposes and that the meeting include central administrators from the university and the schools, and union presidents.

There were several questions that had to be clarified before the contracts could be finalized. Districts wanted to know how many TIs would be needed. What would TIs and coordinators be expected to do? How would their responsibilities be different from what they used to do with full stipends or salary? How many students would be assigned to the PDS each semester? How many would be general-methods, special-methods, and student teachers? Where would we place overflow students, and how would those schools and teachers be compensated? How would we distinguish between the urban PDSs with stipends and the non-PDS urban schools that accept IUN students? Because the entire school would be designated a PDS, but not all teachers would be working with students, how would we ensure that those teachers doing the work would have a vote in how the PDS stipend would be spent? The university wants.to know how much each PDS will cost. How would we be able to duplicate this program in other areas? What other forms of reward could be provided in lieu of cash? How can we assist the districts in achieving their goals? How can we better connect the education of students with the preparation of teachers?

After answering many of these questions, we now have a framework for the institutionalized version of our program that has undergone constant scrutiny and refinement. We have missed many opportunities to conduct action research in the past. But, we are now in a position to improve instruction in both the university and the schools through such research, if we see it as an integral part of what we do with students in both settings.

Teachers College at Columbia University, Manhattan District 3, and the United Federation of Teachers

Summary

In the second profile, which describes the PDS collaboration among Teachers College, Manhattan District 3, and the United Federation of Teachers, Nancy J. Lauter reviews the early history and original intentions of the partnership as well as the current state of institutionalization by reflecting on conversations and survey data provided by members of the PDS executive council (school and college faculty and administrators). This nine-year partnership has ebbed and flowed in relation to resource levels and leadership. Participants report many successes attributable to growing interconnections between dedicated individuals at each institution, yet write candidly of how institutionalization of these approaches faces challenging obstacles of limited time and resources as well as "lack of information and understanding of the PDS within the school and college communities."

Start-up History and Context

In 1980, Teachers College organized a committee composed of one faculty member from each department or program that prepares teachers (elementary and secondary). The charge of this committee, the Teacher Education Policy Committee, is to review existing programs and establish a coherent vision of teacher education with the hope that a collective voice would add status to teacher education programs within the college (Snyder, 1992). During the 1987-88 academic year, the committee's agenda included extensive discussions of the recommendations of The Holmes Group (now The Holmes Partnership). Teachers College was an initiating member of The Holmes Group and one of the first to move toward the establishment of a professional development school.

The committee made two decisions before beginning the process of selecting partners: (1) Teachers College would begin the partnership with their elementary and intermediate programs (K-8, including bilingual and special education) and (2) the committee was unequivocally committed to preparing teachers to teach in urban schools.

The committee contacted representatives in five New York City school districts and two urban districts outside the city. In conversations with districts, the committee reviewed the following: (1) resources in the schools that could be used for the education of preservice teachers, resources at Teachers College that could be used in the schools, and level of interest in sharing resources; (2) level of interest in the schools in teacher education and staff development; (3) competence and experience of the teaching staff; (4) level of support from district level administration; and (5) size of the school. Teachers College pursued a partnership with P.S. 87M and M.S. 44M, an elementary and middle school in Manhattan's District 3.

These two schools have a long history of interaction with Teachers College, their populations represent the diversity within the city, and the schools are across the street from each other and an easy bus or subway ride from Teachers College.

Planning meetings were held with representatives from the schools, district office, the United Federation of Teachers, and Teachers College faculty. As a result of these meetings, a proposal was designed and submitted to the Ford Foundation. The thrust of the proposal was to improve professional education of teachers (preservice, beginning, and experienced teachers, including teacher educators) with an initial emphasis on improving clinical training for preservice teachers through the development of a professional practice school. The stated objectives of the proposal were to (1) develop better learning experiences for preservice teachers (through a defined clinical internship followed by a year as an apprentice in the elementary schools); (2) create new roles and professional development opportunities for classroom teachers; (3) integrate academic and clinical work; and (4) develop a collaborative approach involving all members of the educational community in the continuing development of teachers.

In September 1988, this proposal was approved by the Ford Foundation for $60,000 with in-kind contributions from Teachers College and District 3 totaling $113,410. The Ford Foundation emphasized that it was most interested in the clinical preparation of preservice teachers. By early December, a half-time project coordinator, a retired professor of English from City College in New York, was hired.

Before the Beginning

Institutionalizing reform requires that institutions grow into a new way of relating and perceiving each other—unlearning the stereotypes, discovering commonalities, and defining a shared mission. Most partnerships are poised to begin with set views of the "other," which may be barriers to collaboration. In our case, each institution came with widely acknowledged baggage. P.S. 87M has the reputation of being an elite school within Manhattan's District 3. Its location on the recently gentrified Upper West Side and the dedication of a strong principal who was committed to building a hard-working and cohesive faculty combined to build a reputation of a school with many resources and a star quality that attracted many middle-class families.

In contrast, M.S. 44M had been through several tumultuous years. One year before the PDS project began, a new principal came to M.S. 44M to try to mend the rifts that had resulted from a rapid succession of principals, divisions among faculty, and the ongoing challenges of a large, urban middle school. The new principal divided the school into three mini-schools, and the district brought in two alternative schools. As the PDS project began, faculty and administrators were trying to adjust to these new operational structures. In addition, Teachers College had not had a reputation for being significantly involved or focused on urban education. The newly hired project director commented, ". . . the only suspicion that grew in the minds of the school people . . . concerns the fact that they didn't think of Teachers College as having a particularly good reputation when it came to city schools. That it was a suburban or a national institution, but not a New York City institution" (Snyder, 1992, p. 24). Therefore "before the beginning," the idea of developing a strong partnership among schools and Teachers College was shadowed by pre-formed perceptions of each of the institutions involved.

The United Federation of Teachers, which is the union representing New York City teachers, was invited to join the partnership at the suggestion of the Ford Foundation.

The planning committee managed to forge a plan that reflected principles put forth by The Holmes Group, was agreeable to all constituents on the committee, and fulfilled the requirements of the Ford Foundation. The committee was prepared to move ahead with implementation. During the planning process, committee members had impressed themselves by coming to know the true nature of their partner institutions. "As individuals grew in understanding of the problems of the other collaborators, as their perspective-taking ability increased, they were able to listen better and hear more" (Snyder, 1992, p. 47).

Signs of Change and Institutionalization

Signs of change and institutionalization within our partnership may be grouped into three categories; governance, operations and structures, and expansion of role boundaries. Governance includes both our policymaking body, as well as communication systems within and among our partners. Operations and structures are "new ways of practicing," which involve changes in existing systems, such as reconfiguring the student teaching experience so students spend more time in schools. And, expansion of role boundaries refers to redesigning the nature of our roles through the extension of our practice and expertise in new arenas with different audiences.

Governance. Our PDS partnership (name changed from project to partnership in 1996) is governed by the PDS executive council. The council includes the principal and at least one teacher from each partner school, district (deputy superintendent) and union representation, college faculty from programs engaged with PDS sites including the faculty coordinator of the preservice program, the director of the college's Office of Teacher Education, and the PDS director(s). Since its inception, the partnership has added two elementary schools (P.S. 165M, a bilingual school joined in 1996; and P.S. 149/207M, a school in Harlem joined in 1991) and Beacon High School (an alternative school which joined in 1996). A fourth elementary school may be added in the near future.

The council develops and supports PDS initiatives at each site and sets PDS policies. It is responsible for sharing and facilitating the partnership's mission, selecting new partner members, developing proposals to continue and strengthen PDS work, developing policies for internships, and overseeing the PDS budget.

Council representatives are asked to discuss PDS issues with their constituents and to disseminate information about PDS activities. P.S. 87M has had a school-based PDS committee that meets once a month to discuss PDS activities within the school. The committee includes five or six faculty members, the principal, and the college coordinator of the preservice program. P.S. 149/207M has recently begun to meet as a faculty group to redefine its role as a partner in relation to other partners. The faculty are working to articulate what they must do to be a productive, collaborative partner and what they expect as a member of the partnership. Our newer partners, P.S. 165M and the Beacon High School, recently invited the PDS co-directors to speak with faculty about the nature of the partnership. However, communication and dissemination of information within and among partner institutions lags behind the reality of our work (too few partnership members are aware of and/or engaged in ongoing activities and the opportunities available through the partnership).

Operations and Structures. The partnership has successfully implemented and to a degree institutionalized new structures of four promising practices: (1) The January Experience; (2) the preservice PDS internship; (3) collaborative multidisciplinary teams in the high school; and (4) a school-based seminar for beginning (untenured) teachers.

The January Experience began in 1990-91 at M.S. 44M with 17 classroom teachers, four school administrators, one Teachers College faculty member, 14 student teachers, and 300 middle school students (see Lythcott & Schwartz in Darling-Hammond, 1994). During the 1996-97 academic year, seven teams configured from 30 Teachers College entering teachers (student teachers), 24 M.S. 44M teachers, an M.S. 44M liaison/adjunct TC faculty, a liaison/Teachers College faculty, and two Teachers College graduate students embarked on the seventh January Experience. Planning for this year's experience included a summer planning committee of the school principal, M.S. 44M faculty liaison, Teachers College faculty liaison, the district deputy superintendent, and the PDS co-directors.

The purpose of The January Experience is to enhance student experiences by engaging teacher candidates, school-based teachers, and teacher educators in developing, implementing, and assessing thematic interdisciplinary curriculum. The January Experience is listed as a course in the Teachers College catalogue. The course begins the previous September with an informational meeting, followed by an application process, organizational meeting, five seminars for entering and cooperating teachers, and 20 hours of full-team planning by entering teachers and cooperating teachers. During January, when Teachers College is in intersession, the entering teachers implement a multidisciplinary curriculum with the ongoing mentoring of M.S. 44M teachers and Teachers College resources. Weekly seminars continue during January.

The preservice PDS internship has been a mainstay of the partnership since the beginning. The original or "Cadillac" design was to establish a two-year internship whereby students served as classroom student teachers the first year, and took on the role of apprentice teacher during the second year (often assuming full responsibility for their assigned classroom) under the guidance of a team of two mentor teachers. Due to lack of funding, this design was only in operation for two years with two students completing the full two-year program at P.S. 87M. Clearly, this experience was an excellent induction into the field of teaching, but it was too expensive to maintain on given resources.

The partnership has sustained one-year internships for approximately five elementary interns and two secondary interns each year. Internships are defined by an application process including interviews with classroom teachers and TC faculty, commitment to the public school calendar (student interns follow the public school, rather than the Teachers College, calendar), placement in one or two PDS sites over two semesters (elementary interns change classroom levels within one school at mid-year, and secondary interns usually move from the middle school site to the high school site), and an ability to accomplish the intern milestones in addition to other student teaching requirements. Interns are paid a small stipend that is used to cover a portion of their tuition costs. These funds are made available through the PDS budget; they are not a permanent line item in any institution's budget.

Our newest PDS initiative is the development of multidisciplinary teams of high school faculty, Teachers College faculty (secondary programs), and Teachers College interns who work together to develop a multidisciplinary curriculum for ninth or tenth grade at the Beacon High School. Our goals are to bring together our resources in the areas of theory and practice in order to mentor beginning teachers and provide professional development for experienced teachers and teacher educators. This initiative include collaborative, across-discipline planning; seminars for entering teachers; action-research seminars for interns and school and college-based faculty; and closer connections between our PDS and parent and community groups. This activity is supported by one year of funding from a private foundation.

Another initiative developed this year is a school-based seminar for beginning (non-tenured) teachers that will support teachers' induction into the field, as well as help them restructure a definition of the nature of teaching and learning. The seminar will focus on classroom management, curriculum development and implementation, how to negotiate the New York City public school system, and an orientation to teaching that includes expanding roles and opportunities. This seminar is also supported by a small amount of outside funding.

Expansion of Roles. One goal of our partnership is to support professional development by creating opportunities that allow individuals to reinvent traditional roles by expanding the kind of activities and, therefore, the thinking that is part of our daily professional lives. Our partnership wants all participants to span the boundaries of their current roles. Our PDS has created and sustained the following opportunities for its participants:

- Two school-based faculty are adjunct professors for the TC preservice seminar, a core course, which is college-based. School-based faculty work with a team of TC faculty on the credit-bearing seminar. Other school-based faculty facilitate a one-credit, on-site seminar for interns and student teachers that draws on the human and physical resources of the school.
- TC faculty, graduate students (including PDS interns), and school-based faculty are participant observers and researchers in PDS classrooms. TC faculty and school faculty are collaborating on articles and continuing to develop action research projects based on school practice.
- TC and school-based faculty and PDS interns are collaborating on developing proposals to provide dialogue opportunities and improve/change professional development, standards, and curriculum.
- TC and school-based faculty and administrators attend national conferences together, including The Holmes Partnership annual meetings, and have co-presented at local and regional conferences.
- TC and school-based faculty co-teach courses at both the college and school sites.
- School-based faculty take on leadership roles as liaisons to Teachers College and coordinators of on-site PDS activities.
- Representatives from school- and college-based faculty, and school and college administrators develop policies and set direction for the PDS partnership (i.e., the PDS executive council).
- TC and school-based faculty collaboratively develop milestones that are used to assess and evaluate PDS interns.
- Teachers and PDS co-directors meet to discuss developing the role of a cooperating teacher.
- A weekly seminar for untenured teachers is co-facilitated by a veteran teacher and college faculty.

Reflections and Next Steps

Governance. With regard to the governance of the partnership, there are three challenges that we must work to resolve: (1) Does our PDS executive council reflect all of the necessary voices to build strong partnerships among the schools, college, and communities? (2) How can we create a system of communication that informs all partners on a regular basis so they feel well versed about and engaged with ongoing PDS work? and (3) What is/should be the criteria for expanding our partnership? Our partnership currently is reviewing these issues.

Another challenge related to governance at each institution is what changes should be made in reward systems. At the university level, the current tenure and promotion criteria do not adequately support work in schools as a legitimate service or scholarly function. This year the college hired a senior faculty person, well acquainted with school-university partnerships, to initiate discussions among faculty regarding criteria for bringing such partnerships into the mainstream of faculty work at the college. One of the ongoing conversations focuses on promotion and tenure criteria. How can we build a case for including work and research in schools as serious and valid work of teacher educators?

A recent survey found that faculty who have been involved with our school sites would like to see more support from their colleagues (validation of the importance of work in schools), more semester-long exchanges between college and school faculty, and creation of clinical faculty positions at the college.

Elementary and secondary schools do not have a standardized way of acknowledging a faculty member's work within a partnership. The support of faculty is based on the individual goals of the school principal, and the principals look to the superintendent's office for validation of their interest in partnerships. Although we have been most fortunate in garnering the support of the college dean and the district superintendent, their resources are limited (and/or PDS work is not yet a strong enough priority in either institution). Partnerships are time-consuming and slow to produce demonstrable outcomes, therefore top-down enthusiasm for this work as demonstrated by adequate recognition and resources is often difficult to maintain.

Operations and Structures. We would like to expand and deepen our current initiatives. In order to do so, we must continue to find ways to reallocate existing resources—human, organizational (e.g., time), and financial—in ways that will benefit all constituencies, and we must work toward raising the achievement levels and well-being of our children. For example, a sizable budget is used by the schools, school districts, and union each year to fund professional development of teachers. There is often no cohesive approach to these activities, and many of them use the old paradigm of offering one-shot sessions that are not necessarily relevant for many of the teachers. If we could capture some of these funds for PDS work, it would strengthen the partnership and accelerate our goals. In addition, the college has not yet funded innovative roles for university faculty to work in the schools. At one point the partnership received funding from the Teachers College dean's office that allowed a college faculty person to be in the schools one day a week (released from one course each semester). The presence of a college faculty person in the schools on a regular basis strengthens relationships and communication tenfold. But we have not been able to sustain this arrangement. Again with newly available outside funding, we are experimenting with clustering students and placing a full-time supervisor in a school, particularly during the internship intensive periods during January and May/June. The cooperating teachers, student teachers/interns, college supervisor, and principal agree that the ongoing, visible presence of a college representative is productive and mutually beneficial.

One human resource we need to expand is the number of PDS interns. Currently, we have funded PDS interns (working in classrooms based on the school calendar, spending full days in the classroom during the college's intersession in January and six weeks in May and June) on a small stipend, which pays a portion of their tuition. Because our funding is so low, we have only been able to fund five or six interns each year out of a pool of 322 student teachers at the college. Clearly, the PDS internship is marginal to the traditional student teaching paradigm. In addition, because the internship is so labor-intensive and the financial remuneration so small, we exclude students who need to work during any free periods in order to support themselves.

Finding time to work toward our goals is always a challenge. By program design, we have freed up school faculty who have a PDS intern by giving them professional time while the intern is in the classroom all day, every day in May and June. (Interns must acquire a Board of Education substitute license.) School faculty have the option to leave the classroom to work on professional development activities such as observation of other programs, action research, and mentoring other teachers. In other cases, schools are using some of their staff time to talk about PDS work. And, of course, many individuals make the time because they are dedicated and interested in the topic and the possible outcomes. However, more flexibility in how we use our time is needed. We have not seriously experimented with restructuring the school day or the schedule of faculty at the college. We want to confront and expand our possibilities in relation to the time needed for planning and reflection.

Technology is a tool that can help us create networks of interest. We would like to upgrade the technological capacity of all our partners so we can communicate online regarding ongoing projects and questions or information related to professional development, standards, mentoring, action-research strategies, curriculum, classroom management, and just plain good ideas and resources. It is hoped that networks would take on a life of their own among participants. We know that technology can also be used for online portfolios, sharing documentation, etc. We will explore those possibilities as well.

Finally, we must develop a specific research agenda that includes structures and operations to enable us to collect data regarding student achievement, outcomes of professional development activities, characteristics of a learning community, and contributions to the field regarding our PDS work.

Expansion of Roles. Closely related to the challenges of limited resources in the areas of time, personnel, finances, and the reward systems of individual institutions is the ability to create more flexible roles for teachers and teacher educators. The partnership has broadened perspectives through collaborative work on curriculum, action research projects, and conference presentations. Many individuals, who might not ordinarily do so, have worked together planning, writing, teaching, and developing materials. School- and college-based faculty and administrators have learned from one another.

However, we need to continue to build trusting, professional relationships within and among institutions. Members of our partnership will continue to develop and use collaborative strategies that are productive and mutually beneficial. Uncomfortable histories that continue to exist must be replaced with new working relationships and new opportunities to solve problems collaboratively.

In the future, we would like to continue to span role boundaries through the following initiatives:

- Create a continuum of professional growth experiences that demonstrate teaching as an ever-expanding and dynamically changing role.
- Develop more opportunities for school- and college-based faculty to team-teach college courses and collaboratively engage in developing school curriculum and instructional strategies.
- Engage doctoral students in practice-based research and the culture of learning communities.
- Integrate the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and other standards into our work as beginning and experienced teachers and teacher educators.
- Offer more college, credit-bearing courses, and, possibly, full programs at school sites.
- Provide opportunities for cross-institutional visitations and mentoring across partner sites.

- Provide professional development and roles for school-based faculty interested in becoming college supervisors.
- Cluster interns in schools during their preparation as teacher candidates and during their first year as teachers in New York City schools.
- Engage school and college-based faculty in providing information and support to beginning teachers.

The Learning/Teaching Collaborative Brookline/Boston

Summary

In the third profile, Vivian Troen and Katherine Boles describe how a bottom-up approach, started and sustained initially by classroom teachers, received essential validation and support from powerful individuals both locally and nationally. Because the teachers had relatively little power and access to traditional resources, they had to garner support, create coalitions, and find funding. And, because they had secure positions in the classroom (and no desire to leave them) , they could work at this slowly and behind the scenes, building on their credibility as successful teachers. Troen and Boles detail the step-by-step process by which the Learning/Teaching Collaborative of Brookline/Boston has grown and been institutionalized over the last nine years. They depict the teachers as "entrepreneurial change masters" and stress the need to convince all stakeholders of the benefits of the PDS. As an example, a document Troen prepared for district officials demonstrating specifics of how the PDS Collaborative was meeting the stated goals of the district is included as Appendix B (see page 57).

Start-up History and Context

The Learning/Teaching Collaborative of Brookline/Boston (L/TC) was founded in the fall of 1987 as a collaboration between teachers at the Edward Devotion School in Brookline, Massachusetts and the Graduate School of Wheelock College in Boston. The groundwork for the PDS had been laid a number of years before that. In fact, the period "before the beginning," in the words of Seymour Sarason, was particularly critical to this Collaborative's success because of the limited positional power available to teachers.

The PDS began as a vision of two long-time teachers at the Edward Devotion School who were no strangers to political movements and the intricacies of school culture. Both of us had taught at least 15 years, and together we had shared a classroom of fourth-graders for two years. The idea of reorganizing the way schools worked had been percolating for at least two years and grew out of our dissatisfaction with the *status quo* and our desire to radically change the way schools functioned. We saw collaboration with a college as key to the success of this idea because it would provide us with leverage outside the power structure of the school. We did not assume that our relationship with the college was enough to enable us to make change. We moved simultaneously on several of fronts. We met with representatives of a number of colleges in the area to try out these ideas of collaboration and school restructuring. We wrote an article outlining these ideas that appeared in *Education Week* (Boles & Troen, 1986).

A group of teachers, school and central office administrators, college faculty and administrators, which we dubbed "The Model School Committee," met informally in the evening to discuss possible changes in schools. The group sat around the fireplace in a teacher's house, sipped tea, and dreamed dreams of how schools might change. Minutes were written up after each meeting, and members of the group developed a keen interest in the many possible ways that schools might be reorganized. Coalitions were being built that would be used for years afterward.

The school system showed little interest in our ideas until our article was published in *Education Week* (Boles & Troen, 1986), and the state commissioner of education promised his support. The ongoing support of the school principal bolstered our efforts, and the increasing interest first of a faculty member at Wheelock College and later of Wheelock's president and the dean of the graduate school maintained the momentum during the 1986-87 school year. But it was not until funding was secured from the commissioner and Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, a statewide teacher center, that the Collaborative became a reality. At the same time, a classroom teacher began to participate in and later co-taught a reflective seminar that paralleled the practicum experience. The vision was sustained as support was gathered each year from different sources. Boles' own graduate work with Albert Shanker, then president of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), led to his interest in the work of the L/TC. The AFT's journal of restructuring wrote about the Collaborative, and new connections were established.

A second team of teachers and interns was added at the Devotion School during the second year of the partnership, and Troen began meeting with teachers and principals in other Brookline schools in an effort to broaden the Collaborative. The assistant superintendent of schools began to take serious interest in the movement, and put the strength of her position and her access to the school system's budget to work for the Collaborative. She became Troen's mentor and helped her strategize and plan for the Collaborative's expansion.

The movement had a distinct grass-roots flavor. Connections Troen had with other teachers at one school through a mentoring course she had taught at Wheelock College, and the combined interest of that school's principal and the assistant superintendent of schools, enabled the first satellite school to be added to the Collaborative in the third year.

The school district's decision that the Collaborative not be concentrated in one location increased Troen's outreach efforts.

By the third year, teams in two additional K-8 Brookline schools had been added to the Collaborative, and teams in three schools in Boston joined through the efforts of a key Wheelock faculty member. More interns were needed at this point than Wheelock could provide, and Simmons College joined the Collaborative with interns in one Boston school and one Brookline school. The founding of a steering committee that year with a broad representation of teachers, school and college administrators, and college faculty provided coherence and common goals and activities across the various schools and colleges. Brookline agreed to support the program financially and gave each of three interns a $1,500 stipend. Interns were expected to make a yearlong commitment.

In that same year, a focus was placed on professional development. Four full-day professional development sessions were planned to include teachers, college faculty, and some administrators from both the college and the schools. These sessions have continued until the present and have been crucial in terms of setting collaborative agendas that meet the needs of both the college and the teachers.

Signs of Institutional Change and Institutionalization

By the fourth year, the Lincoln School in Brookline, and Boston's Jackson-Mann School entered the Collaborative. During this period several teachers from the Collaborative were invited to teach college courses, and some college faculty began to discuss course content with teachers in the Collaborative. There was a desire for the college supervisors to develop ongoing relationships with the mentor teachers, and supervisors were assigned to particular schools. The teachers designed a brochure describing L/TC that was paid for by Brookline and the colleges and distributed by the colleges.

Funding was precarious during the Collaborative's first three years and money from a variety of sources, including tuition stipends at Wheelock, was used to fund interns and the extra work of classroom teachers. The increasing support of the assistant superintendent of schools, along with the efforts of the grants coordinator in Brookline, and our continuing drive to maintain the Collaborative paid off in 1991, when the Collaborative was awarded a FIRST Grant from the U.S. Department of Education. This funding allowed the Collaborative to expand and increase its visibility in the broader arena of school reform. By now the Collaborative was not just seen as the idea of a few Brookline teachers. Its constituency had grown, and the list of supporters had increased to include Albert Shanker from the AFT, the ongoing support of a private foundation initiated by parents, and increasing support from other parents and school administrators, all of whom saw something in the various components of the Collaborative that would benefit their constituencies. Various school teams came and left between the fourth and seventh year, by which time it became clear which schools were the most committed.

The steering committee, whose importance expanded each year, provided the mainstay of the Collaborative. With teacher representatives from each school team, and with college, school, and central administration representatives, the committee provided continuity and visibility across the disparate institutions, increased communication and commitment across teams, and provided the linchpin for the Collaborative.

The subcommittees instituted by the steering committee determined the teachers' professional development, interviewed and chose teacher education candidates for internships, and directed the Collaborative. Teachers had power within this committee to determine policy, and they continued to accrue power as the Collaborative grew in size and the PDS movement expanded across the country.

Continuous efforts to connect the Collaborative to larger educational reform movements such as NCREST and the restructuring network of the National Education Association paid off as outside agencies and organizations lent credibility to this PDS movement initiated by teachers. Ongoing efforts at outreach inspired us to write a successful application to the National Education Association for an award as an exemplary school/college collaboration.

Reflections and Next Steps

Institutionalization would not have been a remote possibility had we limited our efforts to the one school and the one college. It would have been beyond the reach of two teachers. Our power base, however fragile it still may be, was broad and continued to get broader. This diminished the likelihood of the Collaborative's demise.

The Collaborative thrived due to the combination of the grass-roots nature of the PDS, the sustained support of classroom teachers whose professional development was enhanced by the Collaborative, and the increased national attention on college/school collaboratives through the PDS movement. None of the factors individually could have enabled the PDS to grow and thrive. Collectively, though, they gave it the possibility of success. When it comes down to it, the most important individual factor in this collaborative has been the drive and determination of the teachers, whose increasing political expertise has enabled them to garner support, build bridges, and cause others to recognize the possibility of change. Using Rosabeth Moss Kanter's (1983) terminology, the teachers have become "entrepreneurial change masters," with increasing expertise in coalition building, networking, and the ability to convince the college and the school that the collaboration improves the quality of life of classroom teachers, preservice interns, and most importantly, children.

Institutionalization is a continuing process. To date, agreements in this collaborative have not been contractual. The strengthening of relationships among the key players has increased trust and enabled the Collaborative to move forward.

Next steps include working to enhance communication between L/TC teachers and the rest of the faculty at each school and exploring ways to involve other teachers who might want to work with interns at a less time-consuming level. Other next steps include utilizing the Collaborative as an umbrella for all inservice and preservice professional development, enhancing the involvement and roles of administrators, and developing a research and evaluation program to assess what the L/TC does.

The Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Program

Summary

In this profile, Robert O.Williams describes the step-by-step process Indiana State University used to start 10 professional development schools in four of its neighboring districts. He highlights the importance of a mutual commitment to the principle of learning-centered schools made by the teacher education faculty as well as by the schools interested in becoming PDSs. He notes the value of thinking about institutionalization issues from the very beginning, stressing the need to address changes in institutional culture and purpose as well as perspectives on personnel and knowledge. Williams concludes that institutionalization does not mean seeing the "same program we have today operating at some future time," but rather a continued evolution toward a blending of the school and university cultures.

Start-up History and Context

The Professional Development Schools Program, a school/university partnership centered at Indiana State University, like other PDS efforts, is a program designed to bring simultaneous reform to schools and educator preparation, cutting across institutional divisions and boundaries and embracing learners from preschool through graduate school. And, like other such programs, it has moved through the adoption phase, is in the implementation phase, and is grappling with the institutionalization phase. This profile begins with a brief overview of the program, notes what changes have occurred, and concludes with a discussion of the issues surrounding institutionalization.

This case is an adaptation of a longer article, "Professional Development Schools: Facing the Challenge of Institutionalization" published in *Contemporary Education*, Vol. 67, No. 4, Summer 1996.

The Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Program, like many others nationwide, is driven by a widely shared conception of PDS programs, but is uniquely shaped by the context of the institutions involved. In the case of the ISU PDS program, necessity generated by internal and external events served as a two-pronged force converging into a unified drive to create a learning community that would impact preschool through graduate school education.

The first necessity was an internal force affecting the School of Education, which by 1990, had just completed an intense five-year study and revision of the teacher preparation programs it offered. While the work of the School of Education had focused on the policies and programs regarding teacher preparation, the work also implied a different vision of schooling—grounded in the idea that a school's mission is not just to offer instruction but to ensure student learning.

This underlying theme shifted the view of the teacher from one of being a solo performing isolate in the classroom carrying out routine procedures and the approved curriculum to one of being a collaborator on issues of curriculum and instruction with colleagues, parents, and students; researcher of his/her own craft; and a mentor to those who want to become teachers. Thus, what became necessary to meet the vision of the new teacher preparation programs was the development of clinical sites that modeled learner-centered schooling.

Just as the new programs in teacher preparation were being implemented, an external force emerged that gave a heightened urgency to the necessity to act. In 1991, the university's board of trustees voted to close the university's laboratory school. Faced with the reality that a needed resource for the clinical field experience component of the teacher preparation programs would soon be gone, Dean Gail Huffman-Joley appointed a "planning for a plan" committee charged with outlining possible alternative actions. The work of this committee became even more urgent because the school was to undergo an NCATE accreditation visit in 1992-93. Guided by the vision of schooling projected by the new programs in teacher preparation, the committee rejected any proposal to simply parachute prospective teachers into classrooms. Instead, it recommended that a collaborative partnership between the university and selected area school districts be formed for the purposes of enhancing the quality of the schooling experience for children and youth and improving teacher development at the preservice, induction, and continuous professional development levels. In short, the committee called for the creation of a learning environment where all contribute and grow from the interactions that are provided. This learning environment would cut across institutional boundaries and divisions creating a seamless continuum of learning—a professional development school. Thus, in fall 1991, the School of Education at ISU entered into a year of intense discussion and planning with four area school districts to establish a professional development schools program. What resulted and was implemented in the fall of 1992 was the ISU PDS program.

For our partnership, the overall purpose of the PDS program is to link reform in schools to reform in educator preparation. To accomplish this, the partnership has projected the following goals: (1) to increase learning for *all* youngsters in the PDS sites; (2) to provide optimal environments for preservice educators in schools committed to restructuring and continuous professional development for faculty; (3) to provide meaningful professional development for university and school faculty based on their needs and selected by them; and (4) to support school/university collaborative inquiry.

The partnership began with 10 schools (five elementary, one middle, and four high schools) in four school districts in west central Indiana. In 1994-95, five schools in the Indianapolis Public Schools were added bringing the total to 15 schools in five school districts. The sites are diverse, cover all grade levels, and include rural and urban settings, with high percentages of students facing impoverished socioeconomic conditions. The urban sites offer preservice teacher education students many opportunities to work with children and youth of highly diverse cultural backgrounds.

A condition for becoming a PDS site was that the faculty and administration of the school would make a commitment to restructuring the school based on learner-centered designs. To give form to the process, each PDS site agreed to develop its own plan for restructuring by applying for Indiana 2000 designation—a status earned through a competitive program established by the Indiana General Assembly and monitored by the Indiana Department of Education. Currently, 12 of the 15 sites have submitted their plans in stiff statewide competition and have received the Indiana 2000 designation, which carries fiscal resources for staff development and allows the school to waive school rules or regulations that inhibit the schools from fulfilling their restructured visions.

At the university, preservice teacher education students complete a sequence of courses required for licensure. Each course carries a field experience requirement that is mutually planned and monitored by the school and university faculty. The PDS program has had a major impact on the quality of the field experience program while at the same time contributing significantly to the content order and organization of the campus-based instruction. Under this partnership, the preservice student is afforded opportunities to discuss such pedagogical concepts as active learning, cooperative groups and projects, and alternative assessment procedures or curricular arrangements such as interdisciplinary /thematic units or service learning and then immediately experience the planning and implementing of such arrangements in the various PDS sites with site and university faculty as partners with them. This reduces or even eliminates the gap between theory and practice and makes it possible for practice to inform theory in teacher preparation.

An important factor in the partnership is the governance structure of the PDS program. The PDS steering committee, composed of representatives from each of the PDS sites and faculty from the School of Education, has the responsibility of directing and coordinating the activities of the program, including allocating resources, planning professional development activities, and promoting collaborative inquiry within the partnership.

Another important feature of the PDS program is the resources that ISU provides to the partnership. They include: (1) $1,000 annual block grant to each site to support program development around the school's goals for the five years of the formal agreement; (2) 15 semester hours of fee waivers per site to support faculty development around each school's goals; (3) $4,000 total annual pool to support collaborative inquiry allocated by the PDS steering committee through submitted proposals; and (4) $25 per practicum student to each host teacher up to a maximum of $200 per semester.

Signs of Institutional Change and Institutionalization

At this point in the fourth year of operation, the ISU PDS program has realized a number of positive outcomes. The partnership has established a new structure for dialogue and collaboration through the PDS steering committee. Each PDS site has established a site-based planning committee of teachers, parents, students, community patrons, and university personnel. Twelve of the 15 PDS sites have been designated as Indiana 2000 schools, and all are projecting ambitious restructuring activities guided by learner-centered programs. More than 70 percent of the early field experiences of preservice teacher education candidates are occurring in the PDS sites in any semester. This means that by the time a preservice teacher education student graduates from ISU, he or she will have had multiple experiences in schools actively engaged in learner-centered reforms with teachers modeling the leadership necessary to make school reform happen.

Further, faculty in both the schools and the university have experienced expanded professional development activities. Site visits to exemplary schools, sharing of professional literature, formation of study teams across and within the partnership sites, and faculty initiated inservice programs are fast becoming standard operations in the partnership. But even more important, the professional development activities coupled with the institutional restructuring activities are beginning to result in altered roles for all in the partnership. For example, the site committees in the PDS sites have moved faculty into the role of stewards responsible for the creation of enhanced learning environments schoolwide and not just in individual classrooms. At the university, faculty are taking on increased responsibilities in schools while maintaining connections at the university moving them toward roles as boundary spanners capable of assisting in institutional improvement at all levels.

Further, the expanded roles for university faculty in the schools are providing enhanced opportunities for what Boyer (1990) called "service scholarship." This new role in service scholarship is not just touching the university faculty but is expanding to the PDS site faculty as well. To date, the PDS steering committee has approved 26 collaborative inquiry proposals that were planned and are being conducted by 96 PDS site faculty with 34 of their colleagues from the university.

These outcomes are attributable to a carefully crafted partnership composed of dedicated professionals. Yet, as broad-based and far-reaching as these outcomes are, what is equally impressive is that they were achieved in the real context of schooling—not in the isolation of a laboratory. Consider the following: The partnership has been sustained through a major contract dispute between the teachers and the central administration of one of the larger districts in the partnership, two department chairpersons of teacher education departments at the university have changed along with three superintendents of the five school districts and five principals of the 15 school sites, and two of the districts have received serious challenges to the reform efforts of the schools by the Religious Right. Clearly, the ISU PDS program is not an experiment protected from the realities confronting today's schools and universities.

Reflections/Next Steps

As successful as the ISU PDS program has been, it cannot yet claim to be fully institutionalized. It is in some ways still too fragile to be left on its own to simply run. This is primarily true because the PDS program lacks longevity and it represents the creation of a new institutional structure. It has been in existence for only four years, and it represents a shift from the perception that teacher development is the sole responsibility of higher education to one that sees teacher development intimately linked to reform in schools and reform in institutions of higher education.

In this relatively infant state, the ISU PDS program is still susceptible to what Joyce, Hersh, and McKibbin (1983) referred to as "homeostatic forces." That is, in any educational institution forces to maintain the *status quo* are always more powerful than the forces for innovation. Therefore, if an innovation is to be successful, it must create ad hoc structures to promote and sustain the innovation, and these ad hoc structures must be recreated each time a decision to innovate is made. Further, if the ad hoc structures weaken (such as loss of special funds or change in personnel) before the innovation becomes a part of the institution, the homeostatic forces will move the organization back to prior operating procedures with little or no evidence that the innovation ever existed. This is what Fullan (1991) was suggesting happened during the period of implementation failure, and lead Sarason (1990) to conclude schools are intractable to reform. Thus, if innovations in schools and universities are to break the power of homeostatic forces, Joyce et al. suggested a condition be created, "in which organizational stability actually depends on the continuous process of school restructuring" (p. 79). This means that waiting to address issues of institutionalization until after the innovation has been implemented will be too late. Institutionalization must be addressed simultaneously with other stages of development. This became the challenge of institutionalization for the ISU PDS program.

Indiana State University had to build an institutional culture of change. Winston Churchill once remarked, "that man creates his institutions and then is controlled by them." The ISU PDS program took his admonition to heart and set out to create a new institution designed to promote growth and change and not control. We began our work toward institutionalization at the same time we entered the initiation phase when the "planning for a plan" committee made its recommendation that a partnership be established between the university and selected school districts for the purpose of linking reform in schools to reform in educator preparation. Although the university had a long history of partnerships with schools, this partnership was to be different from those in the past. We envisioned a partnership that would: (1) enable all involved to grow and develop from the interactions provided, (2) blur the distinctions between the two institutions resulting in a seamless continuum of learning from preschool to graduate school for students and the educators who work with them, and (3) result in a new institution capable of continual change and improvement. To accomplish this vision, we initiated a yearlong series of discussions with all the constituent groups that eventually would compose the partnership. We reasoned that if the partnership was to last and be institutionalized, we needed to collaboratively bring together the multiple perspectives that existed and make clear both the need the partnership would address and collaboratively construct the procedures we would follow.

The discussions centered on the vision of the new partnership and the shift it represented in several interrelated key components from the way we had done business in the past.

Evolving a New Partnership

Purpose. The purpose of the older partnerships was based on rational bonds that were linear and led to standardization. For example, preservice teacher education students in earlier partnerships would have been placed in classrooms for observation and participation experiences without regard for school program context. All that would have been expected is that a standard number of clock hours would have been met. The purpose of the new partnership is to be based on cultural bonds of a shared mission and sense of community. In this instance faculty at both the school and the university would assume responsibility for all learners—planning the field experience to further the instructional goals of the school and college classroom. Even the restructuring plans of the PDS sites would be developed through the cultural bonds of a shared mission as opposed to a program being dictated by some external authority.

Structure. To accommodate the shift in purpose, the partnership must change the structure. In the old partnership, communication would have followed a chain of command resulting in the school faculty member receiving information last. In the new partnership, faculty at both institutions along with the university students mutually plan the field experience, making sure that the reform efforts of the school are linking to the college classroom. In this way, the partnership is promoting practice informing theory, as well as theory informing practice. Further, the new partnership establishes a PDS steering committee composed of equal representatives from the schools and the university to oversee the operations of the partnership. This governing body represents a major shift in school/university partnerships.

Personnel. Still another shift that needed to be made if the first two were to be successful was a departure from how personnel within the partnership has been viewed. In the older partnerships, distinctions were made in the roles of those involved and a hierarchical specialization was implied with the expert knowledge of the university faculty seen as superior to the practical knowledge of the school faculty. Whitford (1994) has noted that this view can, "work against the best intentions of those who see collaboration within a PDS as a means of improving the education of teachers and public school students" (p. 95). In the new partnership all members are to be involved in the decision making, and parity must exist among the participants. From the creation of our shared mission, to the establishment of our governance system, and to the development of our personnel development program, we have made a conscious effort to engage all within the partnership and to respect the contribution made by all.

Knowledge. The fourth component that required a shift in perspective was knowledge. In many respects this shift was fundamental in each of the other components. In a partnership between institutions of learning, the perspective of knowledge that is used drives so many other decisions. For us, we moved from a view that held that knowledge is external to the learner and needs to be transmitted, to one that viewed knowledge as a transaction constructed by the learner actively engaged in the learning process. Such a shift has been fundamental to the school restructuring plans, the early field experience program of the preservice students, and the professional development programs of the faculty at both the schools and the university. Clearly, the shift we made in the perspective of knowledge coupled with the shift in the view of purpose formed a filter for so many other decisions made during the next stage of development of the PDS program.

Implementing a Culture of Change

The implementation stage of the PDS program posed yet another interesting set of issues the partnership had to address if we were to move toward institutionalization. We were, after all, not simply implementing an innovation, we were moving toward a vision that would create a new institution and alter the roles and functions within two existing cultures. What we quickly learned was that what appeared to be so rational and logically straightforward turned out to be sociologically complex and labor intensive. While Fullan (1991), Glickman (1993), Lieberman (1990), Sarason (1982, 1990), and others have noted the issues that must be addressed if implementation of an innovation in schools is to be successful, for us two issues became extremely important, especially related to promoting institutionalization: critical mass and resources.

Critical Mass. During the initiation stage, care was taken to ensure that the voice of all constituents of the partnership were brought to the discussions regarding the need, purpose, and process of the PDS program. Meetings were held with teachers, teacher bargaining units, building and central administrators of the affected school districts, and faculty and administrators of the university. These meetings resulted in a set of carefully composed documents that included a conception of a PDS site, a contractual agreement between the university and the school districts, a set of policies and guidelines for operations, and a plan of action. Yet as complete as these documents were, they still did not ensure that a critical mass of participants would emerge that would move the PDS concept from a project to a program. Two actions were taken immediately by the partnership that had an impact on our ability to create a critical mass and ownership by that group of the PDS program.

The first action involved the partnership planners projecting criteria for schools wanting to become PDS sites. First, the partnership required that a PDS site have a majority of the faculty and the building administration committed to school restructuring. Second, the partnership required that a PDS site have a majority of the faculty and the building administration committed to working with a continuum of teacher development from preservice to induction to continuous professional development. These two criteria ensured that each PDS site would start the journey with a critical mass committed to the goals of the program.

The second action focused on faculty at the university. Because the partnership had placed a high priority on school restructuring, it seemed logical that university faculty involvement should begin with this activity. Thus, university faculty volunteers were sought who would join with a PDS site restructuring team and provide technical assistance in completing the application for the Indiana 2000 program. This action began the process of building trust between the faculty of the two institutions and provided university faculty an opportunity to establish a collaborative relationship with schools and not be seen as intrusive. After four years of the program, many of the original 14 faculty are still involved with the same PDS site and have been joined by more than half the faculty from the School of Education in some form of collaborative work within the PDS sites and the partnership. Through school and university reform and educator development activities conducted collaboratively, the critical mass of participants that initiated the PDS program has steadily grown, moving the PDS program from an ad hoc activity with limited participation to the "way we do business."

Resources. Fundamental to the success of any initiative is the amount of resources that can be marshaled and put behind the effort. Further, the resources must be sustained, allowing the initiative to evolve without the constant concern of dwindling support. Far too many sound programs have disappeared when the money dried up. Because of the importance of this component to any program, we took specific actions designed to address the issue of resources.

The first action we took was in the form of another criterion for school participation in the PDS program. In order to join in the PDS program, the partnership required that all PDS sites be willing to allocate at least 50 percent of their professional development resources to the goals of the program. For the sites, this criterion was the least problematic. Because they receive no dollars for professional development, they humorously indicated a willingness to commit all of their resources in this category. The partnership, however, was not directing this criterion to dollars alone. Instead, the partnership knew that each school had a contractually driven monthly faculty meeting. We simply asked that at least half of this meeting be devoted to discussion and planning of the program. The resource we were after was time.

Another action taken at the schools involved the restructuring plans. Care was taken to address how time was used during the school day through scheduling, and each school incorporated features of site-based management, calling for wider participation in the decisions of school operations by the faculty in the schools. Obviously, the site-based plans required the teachers to collaborate, and this required common meeting times. At the beginning of the program, however, the meetings occurred outside the school day requiring faculty to increase their work. But as the program has evolved, more and more of this work is being done by small and, in some instances, large groups meeting during the school day. The partnership was beginning to implement a basic tenet of the restructuring literature. That is, it is not so much that additional resources are needed to initiate successful school restructuring as it is reallocating the existing resources. This tenet also applied to the university.

When the decision was made to close ISU's laboratory school, the dean moved immediately to capture and redirect those resources. She met with the central administration of the university, which resulted in its commitment of some resources to the PDS initiative and the visible display of assigning the resources as a line item in the university's budget. As meaningful and helpful as these resources were and continue to be, they still did not address the major issue of time within the work of the professoriate. Clearly, collaborative work in schools is labor intensive and time-consuming. As noted above, initial involvement of university faculty came from a cadre of volunteers, and to rely on only this form of involvement would lead to faculty burnout and eventually end the program. Again, the partnership moved to change the culture of the institution and to alter the role of those involved.

Through support from a different program in which the School of Education was involved, interdepartmental faculty study committees were formed based on faculty need and selected by faculty. Topics ranged from studying active learning in college classrooms, to diversity and its impact on schools and universities, to collaborative inquiry with schools, and to enhancing the supervision and quality of field experiences of preservice educators. Where possible, colleagues from the PDS sites joined with these teams opening further the connections between the University and the PDS sites. University faculty quickly saw that involvement in schools would enhance their ability to meet the traditional expectations of teaching, service, and scholarship. In brief, the partnership was assisting faculty to reconceive the role of the professoriate and has led the School of Education to form a committee responsible for drafting standards that bring these reconceived roles into the policies of tenure and promotion. Again, the actions taken were not to find new resources but to redirect existing ones.

It would be misleading to suggest that external or new resources were not needed. They were. But the new external resources were used to address and to bring about a change in the attitudes and beliefs of those involved in the partnership. We believe that this change in attitude is the most important resource needed to bring about institutionalization.

The ISU PDS program is not an experiment wherein ideas are tested in schools with limited participation by either school or university faculty. Instead, the ISU PDS program is an integral part of the preservice through professional development program of the partnership and a catalyst for significant simultaneous renewal of schools and the preparation of educators. Admittedly, we have not fully institutionalized the PDS program nor has this narrative report produced a set of specific steps that would ensure this to occur here or elsewhere. We do believe, however, that institutionalization is not a separate stage in the change process. It is intimately tied to the decisions made in the initiation and the implementation of a program. For us, the test of institutionalization will not be to see the same program we have today operating at some future time. In fact, if this would be the case, our effort will have failed. Instead, the test will be to see something different—an institution that has grown from the blending of two distinct institutions and whose culture expects continual change and improvement as the way to enhance the learning of children and youth and the preparation and professional development of the educators who work in it.

Three Professional Development School Partnerships in Massachusetts

Summary

The last profiles, by Lee Teitel, use a longitudinal approach to examine the impact and institutionalization of PDSs on three partnerships in Massachusetts. The partnerships (described with pseudonyms in the profiles) were selected in 1990 as places which at that point had the longest and most successful records of PDS partnerships in the state (at least four or five years). The set of profiles offers fascinating contrasts: After five years, two of the original partnerships have seen real growth in the PDS model and are starting to see some changes as a result; at the third partnership, however, the departure of a key individual at the college came close to ending the PDS relationship. The third partnership persists in large measure because of the efforts of the teachers in the PDS. Drawing on data from all three partnerships, Teitel highlights several factors that appear to have contributed to institutionalization and several others that seem to have hindered it.

Start-up History and Context

The original three sites were selected from among recipients of 1989-90 Professional Development School Awards administered by the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, a statewide teacher center. Only programs with several years of partnership involvement were asked to participate; all agreed to do so. Data were drawn from available written materials and from interviews with key liaison personnel from the colleges or universities. The five-year update also includes perspectives of key individuals at some of the schools involved in the partnerships.

This case is an adaptation of a longer piece, "Changing Teacher Education Through Professional Development School Partnerships: A Five Year Follow-up Study," presented at the 1996 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York, published in the *Teachers College Record*, Winter 1997, vol. 99, no. 2, (p. 311-334).

The sites ranged in size from an institution with more than 40 full-time faculty members engaged in teacher preparation to one with only three. The largest site (Alpha University) had several different teacher preparation tracks, only one of which had, in 1990, been involved with a PDS. Of the seven full-time faculty members in the PDS-affiliated track, three had been actively involved with the PDS, and about half of the approximately 60 student teachers were placed there each semester.

The smallest site was a private college (Beta College) with only three full-time faculty members in graduate or undergraduate education. In 1990, one professor was involved with the PDS, where about one-fifth of the 30 graduate and undergraduate student teachers were placed each semester. The third site was a medium-size private college (Gamma College) with a variety of undergraduate and graduate education programs, although only graduate students were involved in the PDS. Of the full-time graduate faculty of seven, only two were peripherally involved (as supervisors of students placed in the PDS). The university liaison/coordinator was a part-time faculty member. In 1990, the PDS served about one-third of the 40-45 graduate students placed annually.

Signs of Institutional Change and Institutionalization (1990)

At these three sites in 1990 there were real changes in approach and philosophy, as well as changes in the attitudes of college and university faculty members. In fact, the site-based portions of the three PDS programs were more similar to each other than to the traditional programs offered on each of their respective campuses. Changes included the placement of students with teams and collaborative supervisory structures that honored and took seriously the input of cooperating practitioners, through innovative programs like "grand rounds"—where the medical model was used and interns observed experienced teachers and then talked to them about their lessons afterward. At all three sites, the professional development of veteran school teachers stood out as a significant positive element of the experience. Of particular importance in this research, were the changes in the views of the college and university faculty members about the way they thought about, and worked with, schools, cooperating teachers, and student teachers. In all the PDS partnerships, new and flexible roles were evolving. School teachers were co-teaching, or in some cases, teaching college teacher preparation courses on their own. University faculty were taking expanded roles at the school sites, spending more time building deeper relationships with school faculty, sometimes offering mini-courses on site, that worked with and drew on the expertise of the teachers of the PDS. One long-time university faculty member summed up the PDS experience as "...the most satisfying teacher education I have ever done. I love walking into the building and feeling welcome. The PDS helps us get past the false dichotomy between theory and practice."

Overall, however, the approaches described in the 1990 study, distinctive as they were, co-existed with the more traditional approaches to student teaching and teacher preparation and had only limited effect on changing them. Although the coordinators or college officials associated with each PDS were enthusiastic about the differences in the PDS approach and each thought that most of the education faculty members were at least aware of what was going on, as of 1990 there had been little ripple effect. This lack of impact seemed to be caused by several factors: (1) organizing structures that tended to isolate the PDS and its essentially off-campus activities from the mainstream of the college or university, (2) the tendency to identify the PDS as the special project of the one or two individuals who had been putting the substantial extra time in at the school sites, (3) the lack of many mechanisms or forums for wider consideration or discussion of the ideas associated with the PDS, and (4) the limitations on trying to implement the PDS-style collaborative approach in a traditional student teacher placement program because the collaborative and structural supports were not in place.

In terms of institutionalization, although as of 1990 all three colleges and universities reported plans for expansion to other sites, each also had some evidence of insecurity and instability about levels of institutional support for their current efforts, including the time and money needed to support the PDSs. Most of the extra money that was going into their PDSs was "soft"—discretionary or externally derived from grants. The close identification of the PDS with one, or at most three, faculty members raised questions of whether it could survive the departure of a key individual. The strongest single piece of evidence of institutionalization showing up in the entire study was a change in language of the job description for new hires on the faculty at one institution that called for faculty members to "work in and with schools in developing clinical sites." (At the same time, even at that institution, the traditional reward structure for advancement of junior faculty was still publication in referred journals.) The other positive indication was the increase in student interest in the PDS sites.

Signs of Institutional Change and Institutionalization at each Partnership (1995-96)

Alpha University. At the large university, the number of partnerships with schools has expanded dramatically, and there are now nine sites (three high schools and six middle schools)with another middle school connection being started by a different teacher education program (that had previously not been involved with PDSs or clinical sites). During this period of expansion, the concept and the model for working with schools proved very transferable. As each of the new professional development school partnerships was set up, faculty from the university, and in some cases faculty and administrators from the existing PDSs, came to present models and discuss them. When a state initiative for developing partnerships with middle schools came along, the model was already in place for collaborating with the school, and Alpha University moved quite naturally into expanding to several middle school clinical sites.

Although the ideas have been shared site to site, each partnership has developed its own agreements, customized to meet the needs of the school and the situation. Most of the partnerships have several common features: expanded roles for on-site supervisors (who often are classroom teachers); clusters of student teachers; and a course/seminar taught at the school by a university faculty member, which cooperating teachers can take for free (or at reduced cost). The seminars generally have focused on mentoring strategies or on specific topics requested by the teachers (or a mixture of both). At most sites, the school faculty provide on-site support for student teachers on a range of topics, often determined by a student teacher needs assessment.

Recent activities have included efforts to involve arts and science faculty members. One of the middle schools held an open house where throughout the day, faculty from Alpha University and from another partnering college could meet school faculty and discuss common interests. The session led to several jointly written grant initiatives.

The number of university faculty members involved with these partnerships has grown from two or three at the time of first study to more than half (six out of 11) of the current faculty members. This includes the one new faculty member who has been hired in the last five years. One indication of the university's moves to institutionalize work in the PDS was that when the job was posted, the job description specifically mentioned work in the school partnerships as a part of the job. Another sign of growing institutionalization of the notion of clinical sites has been the successorship transition planned for the replacement of one of the retiring PDS faculty coordinators. The replacement faculty member was identified early and began to become familiarized with the site a full semester before the faculty coordinator retired.

Despite growth of the PDS concept within that particular teacher education program, there has been little spread to the rest of the College of Education. When another program focused on developing a PDS at a different grade level, the program seemed to be starting from scratch, with little or no carryover.

Beta College. In the year following the first study, the small college went ahead with its plans to work with a neighboring community to open a new magnet school that would be designed from the beginning as a professional development school. Staff and administrators from the original PDS cross-visited with the magnet school staff to familiarize them with the model; partnership planning became a three-way proposition. Although the one college faculty member at Beta engaged in PDS hoped the start of a new PDS (one that wasn't so clearly seen by others as "his" PDS) would engage another of his teacher education faculty members, but it did not work out that way. He continued to be the only professor substantially involved in the two PDSs. Not only was he unsuccessful in looping in other college faculty, but another poor sign of institutionalization at the school side was that when the principal who had been key in starting the PDS partnership left in 1993, his position was posted without any mention of the school's status as a PDS. The college coordinator, who was a member of the PDS's school council, argued in vain that this was an important part of the job description and recruitment strategy; a year later when the search for the principal was reopened, there continued to be no mention of the PDS in the job description.

When the college liaison decided to leave for a position coordinating professional development schools elsewhere, it seemed likely that the program would fold, dribble out, and die. There was no real continuity at the college, where none of the remaining faculty members stepped in, or at the school administration level, where the principal and superintendent committed to the PDS had already departed. But the core of teachers at the original PDS retained their commitment and worked with the college faculty member hired to replace the outgoing PDS liaison. A powerful part of this continuity was that six of the 18 classroom teachers at the original PDS were graduates of Beta College who had done their preparation at that PDS. Along with the teacher mentors who had been involved in the program, they worked to keep it going. Relatively few Beta students did student teaching in 1994-95. This, plus the increased demands on the newly hired PDS coordinator at the college, has led her to run the PDS alternating each semester between the first PDS and the magnet school PDS. In addition, the magnet school, which has less experience with the PDS model, may rethink what it means to be a PDS. Beta is also in the process of setting up PDS partnerships with other schools in the same district as the original site, largely at the impetus of the teachers in that community who saw the model working well.

Gamma College. At the teaching college, professional development school partnerships have expanded considerably beyond the one partnership that existed five years ago. Gamma's dean, who five years ago referred to the professional development school partnership as largely "tinkering at the margins" of both institutions, has embraced the PDS as the direction in which he would like the institution to move. The original partnership has grown to include teams in nine schools and two districts, drawing on students from Gamma as well as another college. In addition, Gamma has more than a dozen other PDSs, which have very different kinds of governance structures. Some have developed as part of a partnership with another nearby school district; several more PDSs are part of a program for teachers of students with special needs. A few other PDSs are independent-- usually having grown out of informal linkages between school and college faculty. In addition, undergraduate teacher education programs recently have begun developing PDS relationships, as has the graduate administrative preparation program. Although the degree of formalization, the structure, and the governance of these PDSs vary enormously, they share a growing commitment to a collaborative ideal of working closely with schools in involving the voice of practice in the teaching of the college. School-based teachers have been very vocal in ensuring that the partnerships are mutual; they have pushed for roles in decision making and to have the partnerships collaborate in making increasingly higher-stakes decisions.

These apparently disparate PDS partnerships are all starting to have a powerful integrated and interactive impact. A full-time faculty member has been hired to coordinate the PDS partnerships; she has begun to meet with the liaisons from all the different PDS-type initiatives. Gamma's dean has become a passionate advocate for PDS; he sums up the types of interconnections he envisions, "Although the structures are very different, I see all these PDSs moving toward a similar form—not at the detail level, but up one, at the concept level. We are working at the college on this conceptual overview, bringing together all these different PDSs—not to try to standardize their structures, but to pull together and help fill in the pieces of our direction together." Because of the proliferation of PDSs, more than half of the Gamma faculty are involved with one or more partnership(s); as many as a half a dozen school-based educators are playing roles in planning, teaching, and (to a lesser extent) serving on committees at the college. Teachers receive stipends for some of this additional work and college faculty get additional release time for their partnership work. At the college and in the district, the PDS partnership is a line item in the budget.

Signs of Institutional Change and Institutionalization Across the Partnerships (1995-96)

Looking at changes in the last five years across all three partnerships, the dramatic changes in the student teaching or practicum parts of teacher education brought about by PDS took place when the PDS models were first started. The last five years have led to some subtle refinements due primarily to the maturation of the relationships between school and college, providing for greater understanding and colleagueship on the part of the cooperating teachers as well as a greater involvement of the college supervisor in the life of the school. Cooperating teachers, many of whom have worked with teacher education students from their partner institution for 10 years, know the teacher education program well and, in many cases, have had opportunities to shape it. They are able to enhance the experience of the student teachers through extended internships, on-site seminars, and thoughtful structured mentoring. Similarly, college or university liaisons with at least seven years of involvement in the partnership have become important players in the schools and districts.

Changes have also taken place in the campus-based portion of teacher preparation as a result of increased roles of school-based faculty as teachers, co-teachers, and guest speakers of campus-based courses. Classroom teachers bring the voice of practice into the college classrooms; in addition, they have helped bring about changes in the sequencing of required courses and, occasionally, in the content of the teacher education courses themselves. Other changes are due to different attitudes and approaches taken by campus-based faculty as a result of their involvement in the PDS. One long-time college faculty member engaged in PDS work for the last nine years notes that, "In my methods course I am more concrete. I've always resisted concreteness and 'how-to' approaches. I wanted to plant seeds and encourage long-range thinking, figuring they will get the 'how-to' from their cooperating teacher. Now I am confident that they will, but at the same time I find myself being more concrete in the classroom—the 'how-to' is rubbing off on me."

Some of the signs that PDS is becoming institutionalized as the "way we do business around here" at two of the three institutions studied include successorship issues, changes in job descriptions, college support for the extra work of liaisons, budget lines, and brochures.

Successorship issues. When asked in 1990 what would happen to the PDS concept if he and the one other college faculty member involved in it left, a PDS coordinator estimated a 50-50 chance the idea had taken sufficient root to go on. Five years later, he increased his estimate to 75-25. In fact, when the other principal faculty advocate for PDS announced she was leaving, the question was always who would replace her, not whether to replace her. Furthermore, a transition period was used, where the carefully picked successor overlapped for a semester in the site-based work with the outgoing professor. In another collaborative, the departure of a key central office advocate caused some concerns about continued district support, but the concerns were unfounded. In both PDS partnerships, respondents reported that now no single individual was essential to the perpetuation of the PDS.

Changes in job descriptions. One of the significant signs of institutionalization noted in the 1990 study was the change in job descriptions for new hires at one of the colleges, making clear the job included working in the school partnerships. The one assistant professor hired in the last five years does serve as the liaison to one of the sites.

College support for the extra work of liaisons. At each of the colleges and universities that are solidifying their PDS connections, the liaison role is recognized as a time-consuming one and compensated or considered part of faculty load. At one college, faculty liaisons get a course load reduction in addition to the course equivalency they would get for supervising student teachers. Part-time supervisors are paid more for their work in PDSs, in acknowledgment of the increased time it takes.

Budget lines. In some of the districts and colleges, PDS appears as a line item in the budget. In addition, the partnerships have proved to be excellent bases from which to apply for and receive grant funding.

Brochures. Another example of how PDSs have become the "way we do business around here" shows up in college brochures, where the PDS options are delineated for prospective students to consider.

Reflections and Next Steps

The following approaches appear to have helped promote institutionalization of PDSs:

Building a web of relationships. "Institutionalization is all about building relationships among people," according to one college faculty member. Those partnerships that have successfully engaged more people from school, district, and college or university have garnered additional support as well as stronger connections that help them to survive the loss of a key individual. The effort to include liberal arts faculty is an important part of this. A long-term view of this also includes the hiring of PDS program graduates at the PDS. In one PDS, a third of the teaching faculty had done their internships there, which provided a powerful force for continuity, even in the face of the departure of the key faculty liaison at the college.

External recognition. The involvement of some of these partnerships in national conferences, or publications, or as recipients of national awards and grants has been a powerful boost to the credibility of the PDS advocates. External recognition has helped build support among administrators at school, district, and college. An unanticipated effect has been the deepening of the relationships mentioned above. As college faculty members travel to conferences with their school counterparts, the informal connections grow. As one participant puts it, "We talk shop at the restaurant as well as at the conference. [We talk about] what the role of the cooperating teacher should be, what the supervisor should do. These informal lines of communication help build the relationships."

Finding and sustaining allies. Some of the PDS advocates have been successful in demonstrating to key players in the district and college how the PDS contributes to their goals and objectives at a relatively low cost. In one district, the PDS coordinator produced a document that listed the stated district core values and goals and identified specific ways in which the PDS contributed to attaining the values and goals. Another advocate has tried to point out to the district how the interns provide the many "extra pairs of hands to work with children" or how they free up cooperating teachers for many of the school's leadership roles. Others have been successful in gaining parental support that has led both to district support as well as financial contributions from parents to support some of the added costs of the PDS.

Organizational details, procedures and structures. Respondents suggest a number of procedural details they feel contribute to the institutionalizing of PDSs. Using the same supervisor at each PDS site helps support continuity. Joint professional development days for all participants (not just cooperating teachers) means that everybody, including the college supervisors, is sharing in the same activities, hearing the same messages, and exploring the same issues and concerns together. Some programs have found it very useful to weave in other staff members from around the college or university (and the school), so that staff from the admission and financial aid offices, and the registrar are involved, have input, and are informed about the ways the PDS affects their work. Several respondents point to the importance of using the addition of new sites as opportunities for broader involvement—a way to expand the web of relationships mentioned earlier.

Finally, organizational structures that include top-level people have been important. One collaborative uses a large steering committee that meets quarterly, along with several subcommittees that meet more frequently for the day-to-day decisions.

Some factors that have appeared to work against institutionalization. Several factors are the flip sides of the ones mentioned earlier. For instance, problems can be caused when junior faculty are hired with specific expectations for involvement in partnership sites, without a change in reward structures and other expectations. As one senior faculty member reflects on it: "This has not been a perfect process, since [the new faculty member] still has other pressures on his time. Writing the expectation in the job description is one thing; recruiting for it is another; making it happen is another." In a second example of how signs of institutionalization can cut both ways, a PDS liaison, who cited the fact that supervisors were being paid for the extra work they did for PDSs, realized when she examined it more closely that most of the supplemental money is grant funded, which raised questions about her college's long-term commitment to this concept. Even where faculty members are given extra course release time to allow for the extra work of the relationship-building in the PDS, sometimes other demands on the time of short-staffed education departments mean that faculty liaisons do not even take the course releases they are entitled to.

Other challenges include issues of maintenance and of growth, as well as opposition that may have been triggered by the success of the PDS. Participants indicate that in some ways it is harder to maintain a PDS than to initiate one. A coordinator describes one of his PDSs as having had "a high-energy start-up," a "great middle period," but notes that now the "tricky part is maintaining all the faculty interest. [The PDS] is not exactly struggling, but we are working to maintain what we have already done." Participants note the need to "constantly overcome inertia" and put in energy, especially in dealing with the politics of keeping support for the PDS at the college and the district. At one college, a liaison notes how with all the change that has gone on, it seems important to take some time to consolidate: "There's so much growth [with the PDS concept] in the last few years, our systems haven't kept pace with it." She wants time to figure out what, for instance, is the right mix of people or the right size of the cohort at the site.

The very success of these PDSs creates new obstacles, challenges, and questions at the institutional and the partnership levels. Inside colleges and districts, harder questions are being asked than when the PDS was small and more marginalized. Within one district, for instance, success of the PDS and the attendant visibility may lead to more concerns about equity issues. As the PDS, which only operates in some of the district schools, publicizes its successes as part of a strategy to secure higher levels of stable funding, there is a risk of triggering questions about why all the schools are not receiving the benefits. Similar equity issues arise at the college. As PDS placements approach half of the preservice teachers and are widely seen as better quality placements, administrators and students may wonder why these PDS placements are not available to all. On one campus, there has been some tension within the faculty about the spread of certain PDS-type approaches. This creates a double bind, where faculty not involved with the PDS efforts object to what they perceive as additional resources going to the PDS, but also oppose any efforts to require them to use PDS approaches for all preservice teachers.

At the partnership level, other issues emerge as PDSs develop deeper inter-institutional relationships. For example, PDS classroom teachers who are now more deeply involved in teacher education may be dissatisfied with what they see as the poor preparation student teachers are getting at the college. As the partnership matures, they are more likely to want to voice their concerns and are likely to feel frustrated if they have been unable to influence or improve matters. On the other hand, college personnel may find themselves looking askance at some of the teaching practices they see, as they place more students at a particular school. In one partnership, members of the college staff express concerns about some aspects of how a partner school responds to students of color. As the relationship deepens, the college is more likely to see how the school's practice affects them, and to bring up a potentially conflictual issue: "We are thinking about how their approach to multi-culturalism affects our students. It is a maturation thing—our relationship used to be more superficial and we would say 'How great it is that we have these partnerships.' Now we are looking at each partnership more closely and it's getting really serious."

The more intense mutual scrutiny emerging at some of these PDSs is a natural part of the maturational process. What happens to the frustrations and tensions that surface is critical to the future of the PDS and to the meaning of "institutionalization." These issues, along with others that cut across all of the cases, will be discussed in the conclusion.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION: CHALLENGES AND CONTINUING TENSIONS

The profiles, drawing on data from a variety of settings, tell success stories of how PDS partnerships have begun the process of weaving the PDS into the fabric of the institutions—moving toward being the "accepted way of doing business." The profiles provide numerous suggestions and strategies for organizing resources and personnel, and for making the structural and cultural changes necessary for institutionalization. At the same time, the profiles highlight a number of the common challenges faced by schools and colleges working to institutionalize PDSs partnerships and approaches. Some of these are typical start-up challenges faced by new ventures that are bent on being innovative while simultaneously being accepted by and incorporated into their organizations. Other difficult issues arise from the very successes of the PDSs. This concluding section looks at each of the seven "signs of institutionalization" described in the introduction and identifies some of the challenges and continuing tensions related to it. It draws on the profiles as well as on some summaries of the broader PDS literature, incorporating segments of Teitel's recent literature review (1996) and his work on governance models for PDSs (1997). If professional development school partnerships are to be more than passing projects, PDS participants must understand and address these challenges and continuing tensions.

Signs of Institutionalization

The PDS is integral to the partnership and to the operation of both the school and the college or university; the PDS is used in job descriptions, course catalogs, integrated into the core values, culture and attitudes and, in general is "woven into the fabric" of participating institutions.

Although the goal of having PDSs become integral to the operation of both school and college or university is clearly essential for institutionalization, the path to get there is filled with challenges and choices. Most of the early PDSs started on the margins of their organizations as small supplemental programs, which made it harder to have influence on and become institutionalized into the rest of the larger organization. The description of the start-up and status of the Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC) (Grossman, 1994) captures this: "A small ad-hocracy wedged in the cracks of the formal organizational structure of the college rapidly created the professional development center" (p. 42). Such ad-hocracies may be critical to innovative efforts within large bureaucratic institutions.

Without substantive restructuring of the college, however, the very ad-hocracy that enabled the PSPDC to emerge swiftly as an entity may relegate it to the permanent periphery of university life. Grossman's experience in Puget Sound is typical. Darling-Hammond (1994) sums up:

> The usual dilemma of school reform is magnified here. Because new ideas and projects threaten the "behavioral and programmatic regularities" of schools (Sarason, 1982), they frequently need to be created at the margins of the institution so they can be ignored long enough to take root. The dilemma, of course, is that if such initiatives continue to live at the periphery of the organization, they fail at their overall mission. In the case of the PDS, the difficulties are doubled, since it is the core of two previously separate institutions which must be infiltrated, connected and simultaneously transformed (p. 22).

What are the implications of these findings for those seeking to institutionalize PDSs? On one hand, partnerships are easier to start on the margins of organizations, where the bending of rules necessary for innovation may be unnoticed or overlooked; on the other hand, for any changes developed in the partnership to be systemic, they need to be integrated with and woven into the fabric of the entire institution. An initial challenge faced by any start-up PDS is resolving this tension: Should the PDS start on the margins and then work its way toward being more central? Or, learning from the PDS pioneers, should it start with as much centralized commitment and high level support as possible?

Among the profiles prepared for this chapter, only Indiana State University started PDSs as a central part of the direction of the teacher education programs. The rest can be more accurately described (at least in the beginning) as alternative approaches that were then pulled into the mainstream. The issues of centrality/marginality remain a continuing tension since approaches that are ignored when the PDS is a marginal program can garner more opposition when they seem to be harbingers of what is to come. In one of the colleges studied by Teitel, faculty members who were not involved in the PDS tolerated it for many years until recently. As the program has grown and gotten the dean's support, they began to get uncomfortable with what they saw as extra resources going to the PDS, and with the possibility that they might have to change their own approaches to schools and teaching. Troen and Boles report that as professional development schools have grown and become more accepted in a school district, new questions of equity have been raised as principals wonder why some schools have more PDS interns than others.

A critical mass of persons is involved in the PDS from participating institutions, including those with leadership and authority.

PDS partnerships are made by people—people who look outside the boundaries of their own organization and see that the benefits of collaboration with others outweigh the costs. Partnerships, especially in the beginning, are often based on strong personal connections between one or a few individuals from each organization. Yet as long as those relationships are personal and are not structured into job descriptions, partnerships are highly susceptible to staff turnover. And as long as one or a few individuals from each organization are the only ones to interact with members of the other organization, these partnerships may never be fully, or more broadly, realized. The challenge is to foster and support those personal relationships, to greatly expand the multiple linkages among people at all roles in school and university, and to also move toward institutionalizing the relationship, through job descriptions and the like. PDSs need multiple and personal connections, constantly seeking the widest participation possible of colleagues on both sides of the boundaries. PDSs need to put people into contact with one another and then to build those contacts into relationships. The boundary between the two organizations should not be the narrow intersection of the liaisons and a handful of others, but the longest possible border, with multiple large and small connections. For example, math faculty members at the college should be connected to those who teach and coordinate math at the school, school nurses should be working with (or become part of) the university's school of nursing's clinical faculty, principals should be involved with the educational administration program, and so forth. Addressing the challenge of engaging many people from both organizations is not only important in changing the culture of the collaborating institutions, but crucial in developing a web of connections and relationships that helps sustain PDSs and support the kind of flexible institutionalization that is needed.

In his profile of Indiana State University, Williams notes the importance of having university faculty work in a sustained way with the PDS site restructuring teams; building trust and collaborative relationships. Most of these original 14 faculty members continued after four years to be engaged with the PDSs, and have been augmented by others, so that more than half of the School of Education faculty are involved, along with a critical mass of school-based educators. Troen and Boles also note how the growing informal relationships among people at each institution were key in augmenting the structural linkages through the steering committee. As one college faculty member in Teitel's profile puts it, "institutionalization is all about building relationships between people."

A continuing tension related to this issue of critical mass is the continual need to draw in new people, many of whom will not have been involved in the discussions and excitement back at the start-up of the PDS. Part of what is important in institutionalizing a PDS is having ongoing, stable commitments—to a partner, to a set of goals for students and for preservice teachers. Yet it is also important to involve new participants in ways that draw on their ideas and visions for the partnership. Doing this becomes an ongoing balancing act and a continuing tension.

Finally, the involvement of those with power and authority, while ultimately essential to institutionalization, can be a mixed blessing, especially in start-up phases. As discussed under the previous heading, premature high-level support for a PDS may lead to an increase in attention and possible opposition before the fledgling PDS can get rooted. Furthermore, over time, leaders may come and go; PDSs that are dependent on the support of one or two people may have trouble during administrative turnover, especially if new administrators do not see the PDS as part of their responsibilities and subsequently do not develop a commitment to it. An important sign of institutionalization is the ability to survive departure of a supporter with power and authority. Both Williams and Reed describe how the PDS approach at their respective institutions continued despite the turnover of the various chancellors, deans, principals, or superintendents; both point to continuation of the PDSs as a sign of their good institutionalization. Troen and Boles describe the strong support of an assistant superintendent who then left; the fact that the partnership was able to continue to thrive was a measure of how firmly rooted it was among the teachers. Teitel provides an illustration of the lack of institutionalization in one PDS partnership that almost unraveled after the departure of the principal and the head of teacher education. In the job descriptions used for hiring the successors, no mention was made of the PDS, which had existed for six years.

> *A governance structure is present that engages the voices of faculty members and other staff and administrators in ways that allow for ownership, continuity, communication, vitality, and commitment.*

For participants in a PDS, figuring out how to best organize and govern it is a challenge for several reasons. PDSs are inter-organizational collaborations, and the models for successfully linking two or more institutions are less well-developed than those for intra-institutional governance. Even in the best of circumstances, inter-organizational relationships are often problematic, prone to breakdowns in communication, disagreement over resource allocations, differences in expectations, and so on. But PDS partnerships add several overlays to the usual challenges of collaboration, because they represent two institutions engaged in mutual renewal that are simultaneously trying to expand professional development opportunities at both institutions; engage in research and development and improve the education of children, adolescents, and prospective teachers. For PDS partnerships that are taking seriously their mission in the simultaneous renewal of schools and the preparation of teachers, the challenges of partnership are intensified. Governance is not just a way to figure out how to make decisions and implement them in a "business-as-usual" way between two static and unchanging organizations. In more developed PDSs, governance has to promote a real change agenda. This entails defining roles for participants to play in each other's decision-making processes and figuring out ways for this new joint decision making to mesh with the pre-existing governance structures of each organization.

Governance models for the PDSs in the profiles presented here face these challenges in different ways. The Teachers College/NYC partnership has an executive council that makes decisions regarding PDS policies and activities. Indiana State University has a PDS steering committee that directs and coordinates the activities of its program and is empowered to make certain resource allocations. Indiana University Northwest has had a policy board, but is moving toward an advisory board structure as its program becomes integrated into the Division of Education. Despite the differences in names and forms, all these governance mechanisms try to meet the challenge of having a wide representation of stakeholders on these governing bodies, ensuring that there is enough top-level involvement and support (from the district, the school, and the college) as well as sufficient representation and involvement of the faculty and staff from both institutions who do the day-to-day work. The Learning/Teaching Collaborative meets these needs by combining a large steering committee (which includes high-level administrators as well as teachers from all the institutions) that meets quarterly to set broad policy, with a subcommittee structure that meets more regularly to deal with day-to-day affairs, such as selection and placement of interns, teachers' professional development, and so forth.

A continuing tension faced by PDS governance is retaining enough flexibility to avoid stultification. Governance structures themselves have to evolve to meet the changing needs of the PDS. For instance, the governance model that might have worked well for a small marginalized start-up PDS may be inadequate to the tasks of managing a larger, more central partnership. PDSs need to be fluid in their structures, but consistent in the visions, goals, and directions in which they seek to move.

Adequate resources are available, including a budget line at participating institutions, and a schedule that permits staffs from the respective institutions to focus on issues and work pertaining to the PDS during their regular workday.

In many PDS partnerships, especially in the beginning stages, a considerable amount of extra work is done by committed participants, often in addition to their regular jobs. As PDS work moves in from the margins and moves away from being done on the backs of dedicated people, schools, colleges and districts have to look at the real costs in time and money. PDSs face the challenge of finding reliable sources of money,and, moreover, freeing up staff members' time to work with the PDS.

Most PDSs begin with some sort of external funding or other soft money, which can be a mixed blessing in the institutionalization process. Many PDSs get a crucial boost from one or more external grants; yet grant money can make a program vulnerable, and more unlikely to become institutionalized. Case and others (1993) argue that PDS initiatives should not be funded with grant money—that the core of what is done should be based on reallocation of existing resources and time. They note that at the university and the school, too many people have seen too many projects disappear once the soft money stopped flowing. By changing job descriptions and curriculum approaches and by seeking economies of scale in student teaching and alignment of research, service, and teaching, they describe how their PDS partnerships use existing resources for core activities and get jointly written external grants to augment their activities. Harris and Harris (1995) describe how several of the partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal address the challenge of finding time and money through creative exchanges. In one instance, the PDS uses money the university would ordinarily pay to part-time student teacher supervisors to hire preservice teachers to work as half-time interns, thereby freeing capable cooperating teachers to supervise other preservice teachers. In another setting, cooperating teachers whose classes are being taught by capable preservice teachers replace other teachers for professional development workshops, etc. Harris and Harris note that when dollar values are assigned to these activities, their one PDS network (Brigham Young University, with 23 partner schools) had an operating cost of $750,000 that was all exchanged in kind, with no money transferred at all. Elsewhere in this book, Clark and others identify other calculations of PDS costs and sources of money. (See R. Clark's chapter in this collection.)

In the profiles, Williams describes how the resources from a closed lab school were diverted to a program that has grown to include 15 PDSs, through careful redirection of internal funding along with judicious supplementary grant monies. In addition, districts agreed to commit 50 percent of their professional development resources to the partnerships. Reed reports the difficulties of moving from hefty grant funding to having costs picked up by the districts, noting the importance of having the university promise to use part of its state funding for support and having the urban school districts buy in for a certain amount. Troen and Boles note the symbolic and practical importance of the district paying for the intern stipends. But as the program has grown and gotten more recognition, the presence of interns in schools has come to be seen as more desirable and non-involved schools in the district have raised questions about allocation of resources. In the Teachers College/NYC partnership, the cost of the intern stipends has become a factor, limiting the growth of the PDS model.

A challenge at all points in the process, and certainly an important continuing tension is finding time during the regular workday for PDS work. Reed notes the importance of a faculty-in-residence program that provides time for a college faculty member to work at the school. Williams describes an important transition when PDS planning meetings stopped being an add-on and started to be held during the workday. Elsewhere, Boles (1994) describes the use of alternative professional teaching time—one of the few models that provides a day a week of release time for the classroom teacher involved in the PDS. The college faculty in Teitel's study see as critical signs of institutionalization their college's willingness to provide a course release as compensation to full-time faculty for the additional work they do in PDSs.

With the passage of time, it becomes more and more difficult to ask people to do PDS work as an add-on. It becomes more and more obvious that real additional time and money are needed to properly run a PDS. This raises the tough questions of who should pay. Continued funding for PDSs as part of an institutional base is complex and often politically difficult, getting to fundamental questions about the mission of both institutions.

Professional development regularly takes place that acknowledges new roles for all the professionals involved in a PDS (pre- and inservice teachers as well as other professionals—counselors, administrators, etc.) at the school and the college and is conducted in a mutually beneficial and reciprocal way through the PDS.

At the heart of the PDS is the professional development of educators which, at least in theory, is for all educators—teachers as well as administrators and other education personnel, at the college as well as at the school. Yet most of what is reported in the literature and in these profiles about PDS professional development focuses on K-12 teachers, with less attention paid to the professional development of university faculty and even less to that of administrators at either institution. This imbalance suggests the possibility that there may be differing perceptions of the need for and importance of continuing professional development for all participants in the PDS. In fact, some of the few references to principals note the importance of their involvement in the PDS, but also include the fact that they are often left out and frequently get little support and professional development for the changing roles they face (Trachtman & Levine, 1994).

The challenge here is to establish and maintain mutuality, and create new models of delivery that break old patterns. Furthermore, there is a continuing tension around making sure that as new roles develop for teachers and administrators at the school and university, and for parents, community members and other stakeholders, professional development evolves to keep up with them. Williams gives an example of this when he writes that "professional development activities coupled with the institutional restructuring are beginning to result in altered roles for all in the partnership." He cites as examples school faculties taking greater "stewardship" of the school, not just their own classrooms, and university faculty developing more "service scholarship."

The reward system—including salary, incentives, promotion, and tenure at participating institutions—reflects the importance of PDS work.

Although changes in reward structures are essential to institutionalization, both symbolically and practically, there is very little in the profiles or in the literature to show changes. Those who address the question in our profiles report no change. In one of the colleges studied by Teitel, a change in the job description language for a new faculty member to include a role in the clinical sites was seen as a significant move toward institution, yet the guidelines for promotion and tenure for the new position remained unchanged.

Reed includes specific recommendations for changes in faculty reward structures on her "wish list" of next steps.

Reports in the literature tell the same story--that this challenge is still largely being unmet. Creek (1995) reports no change in university faculty rewards, and others make similar comments about rewards for K-12 teachers (Book, 1996; see Snyder in Darling-Hammond, 1994). There is also some anecdotal evidence that junior faculty members may reduce their chances of receiving promotion and tenure by engaging in the time-consuming work of a PDS, because they are not producing the empirical research usually valued at the university. There are a few more positive reports. Case and others (1993) report that although faculty members are still expected to publish in refereed journals, equal weight at their research university is now given to the kind of field-based research that might come out of a PDS.

> *Assessment processes provide for on-going inquiry in and on the PDS to insure that institutionalization does not just lead to new structures and policies that appear innovative, but do not improve the learning of students and teachers. Assessment processes need to check back to make sure the PDS is meeting the original or evolving mission and goals for the partnership. Assessment is also key to locating and sustaining stable funding and support from outside funders and from decision makers at the district and college levels.*

There are three major areas of challenge associated with the issues outlined in this item. One concerns assessment and inquiry into the effectiveness of PDS. Berry and his colleagues discuss this at some length in this volume, as does Teitel's (1996) literature review. Both suggest that, on a national level, this challenge has still, by and large, not been met: most PDSs are still trying to figure out how to assess their effectiveness in ways that are meaningful to them and also to policymakers or grant funders. Although there are a number of good suggestions for research agendas (Hunkins and others, 1995; Clark, 1995), overall, despite considerable discussion in the literature about the definition and purposes of inquiry in the PDS, it seems clear that for many PDSs nationally, as well as those in these profiles, assessment and collaborative inquiry are still in their early stages.

The second challenge raised by this item concerns establishing assessment processes to ensure that the PDS is meeting its original mission. What processes are in place for PDS partnerships to reflect on and monitor this? Failure to regularly check the progress of the PDS against its goals may raise questions about just what is being institutionalized. Elsewhere, in a longer reflection on the profiles in this chapter Teitel (1996b) summarizes the gains these three PDS partnerships had made, but raises a more fundamental question:

> As someone who believes in the value of PDSs, I am pleased by these findings. I am impressed with the gains that have been made at these institutions, and filled with admiration for the dedicated faculty and administrators at the schools and colleges and universities for their perseverance, often in the face of opposition, and limited resources, to make these PDSs work. I have no doubt that their work is improving the lives of preservice teachers, students, and experienced educators.
>
> At the same time, I am left with a nagging thought about exactly what is getting institutionalized in these partnerships. When I frame the successes of these partnerships with the view that professional development schools should serve as mechanisms for simultaneous and mutual renewal of schools and teacher education programs, these achievements start to look less substantial. What seems to have gotten institutionalized here are better methods of conducting the field experience portion of preservice education, by using approaches that not only benefit the preservice teachers, but have many excellent spinoffs for the experienced teachers at the school and college. These positive interactions between the worlds of school and college are starting to get institutionalized in these PDS, and are leading to some benefits and some modest changes in both places, but I worry that the core enterprise at each place is not being touched. What is worse, I worry that that core may never be touched, that the relationships have reached (or will soon reach) a plateau, and will stay there, because the participants are basically satisfied with the very real successes they have attained (p. 15).

These concerns lead to the question of whether the "plateau effect" is inevitable. Tyack and Cuban (1995) suggest that most innovations that get successfully institutionalized do so by being adapted (some may say perverted) to match institutional needs. Is that the case here? Are the primary goals for the college to get better student teaching placements and offer higher quality field experiences for preservice teachers? Are the primary goals for the school and district to improve the quality of their student teacher pool and provide professional development opportunities for their experienced educators? If so, then PDSs may get institutionalized as cluster sites for student teachers, with strong involvement and interaction of classroom teachers with preservice teachers and college faculty. Although this is an improvement over traditional student teaching, is that as good as it gets?

The third challenge relates to the question of what exactly is getting institutionalized–specifically the impacts that the growth of professional development schools may have on equity. Analysis of the intended and unintended impacts of PDS (Murrell and Borunda, in this volume, for instance, and Valli, Cooper, and Frankes [1997]) raise important questions about issues of equity. These include the inability of PDSs as yet to show measurable progress in reducing the inequality of educational opportunity for children and youth; the scant progress made by PDSs in developing local community networks; and concerns that, if PDSs become the gateways into the teaching profession, their longer internship requirements may inadvertently serve as obstacles to people of color and those who cannot afford the longer time commitments.

This discussion highlights and returns to the larger question: how does what might be getting institutionalized fit with the original or evolving mission of the PDS? PDS partners need to make opportunities to periodically reexamine their goals, discuss where they are going and whether they have gotten stuck along the way. PDSs need to institutionalize processes that allow for, and even require, honest reflection and dialogue. These discussions, which ask people to step back from the day to day concerns of the partnership, may need to have some outside facilitating, potentially an important role for networks and other third parties assisting with PDS partnerships. This is a continuing tension that PDSs must address to remain flexible and responsive to their original and evolving goals. Institutionalization must be defined in ways that allow and encourage partnerships to grow and push to higher levels of their work with each other. Williams captures the flavor of this when he writes about the continual process of improvement and refinement needed in institutionalizing the PDS: "For us, the test of institutionalization will not be to see the same program we have today operating at some future time. In fact if this would be the case, our effort would have failed."

The challenges and continuing tensions described above will play out somewhat differently in each collaboration, but it is essential they be addressed, if PDS is to be more than a passing fad. Readers may find the short Institutionalization Checklist in the Appendix useful. It lists the seven signs of institutionalization in the form of a brief questionnaire. With space for respondents to describe where their institutions currently are and where they hope to be on these seven dimensions, the questions can be useful in provoking discussion and self-analysis. Hopefully, in combination with the suggestions from the profiles shared here, the checklist can work as a catalyst for better understanding what institutionalization means and for helping professional development schools reach their potential as a way to simultaneously renew schools and teacher education.

REFERENCES

Boles, K. (1994). Teacher leadership in PDS. PDS Network News, 1 (3).

Boles, K. & Troen, V. (1986, September 24). A "career options" plan for teachers. [Commentary]. Education Week, 6 (3), p. 21.

Book, C. (1996). Professional development schools. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, and E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Case, C. W., Norlander, K. A., & Reagan, T. (1993). Cultural transformation in an urban professional development center: Policy implications for school-university collaboration. Educational Policy, 7 (1), 40-60.

Clark, R. (1995). Evaluating partner schools. In Osguthorpe, Russell et al. (Eds.), Partner schools: Centers for Educational Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creek, R. J. (1995). The professional development school: Tomorrow's school or today's fantasy. In Hugh G. Petrie (Ed.), Professionalization, partnership, and power: Building professional development schools (pp. 241-252). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenge and promise. In Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 1-27). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Glickman, C.D. (1993). Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grossman, P. (1994). In pursuit of a dual agenda: Creating a middle level professional development school. In Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. (pp. 50-73). New York: Teachers College Press.

Harris, C., & Harris, M. (1995). Launching and sustaining a partner school. In R. Osguthorpe, et al. (Eds.), Partner schools. Seattle, WA: Centers for Educational Renewal.

Hunkins, F., Wiseman, D., & Williams, R. (1995). Supporting collaborative inquiry. In R. Osguthorpe, et al. (Eds.), Partner schools. Seattle, WA: Centers for Educational Renewal.

Joyce, B. R., Hersh, R. H., & McKibbin, M. (1983). The structure of school improvement. New York: Longman, Inc.

Kanter, E. M. (1983). The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.) (1990). Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Snyder, J. (1992). Documentation of the first three years of the District Three/United Federation of Teachers/Teachers College Professional Development School Project. Report to the Ford Foundation, 1992.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development schools: A literature review. Washington, DC: Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Teitel, L. (1996b, April). Changing teacher education through professional development school partnerships: A five year follow-up study. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York.

Teitel, L. (1997). The organization and governance of professional development schools. In M. Levine, & R. Trachtman (Eds.), Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice and policy (pp. 115-133). New York: Teachers College Press.

Trachtman, R., & Levine, M. (1994, fall). Reinventing leadership for professional development schools. PDS Network News, 1 (4).

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. (1995). Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valli, L., Cooper, D., & Frankes, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. Review of Research in Education, 22. Washington, DC: AERA.

Whitford, B.L. (1994). Permission, persistence, and resistance: Linking high school restructuring with teacher education reform. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 74-97). New York: Teachers College Press.

APPENDIX A

Institutionalization Focus Questions

1. Background information
   - size of teacher preparation program
   - relative proportion of students and faculty involved in PDS
   - roles of school and university-based faculty in PDS
   - changes in numbers or roles over the last few years
   - involvement of faculty from other university units

2. What is happening? What are signs of institutional change at your site?

   A. At the college or university (partial list)
   - modification of courses or programs to better draw on practice
   - involvement of school-based faculty in planning and teaching courses
   - shifts in accountability and responsibility for student teacher evaluation
   - changes in numbers of college faculty and students involved in PDS
   - changes in attitudes at college about schools, and the role of practice
   - different approaches to governance that draw in school-based personnel
   - changes in reward structures to support and encourage involvement with PDS

   B. At the school (partial list)
   - involvement of college-based faculty in planning and teaching courses
   - increased sense of ownership of K-12 student learning by college faculty.
   - greater school-based faculty responsibility for student teachers
   - changes in numbers of teachers and students involved in PDS
   - different approaches to governance that draw in college personnel
   - changes in reward structures to support and encourage involvement with PDS
   - increases in inquiry/reflective practice

   C. At the collaborative level (partial list)
   - changes in governance funding patterns
   - types of decisions being made by the Collaborative
   - number or types of people involved (from each institution)
   - new roles that span institutional boundaries
   - contracts, letters of agreement, mission statements (as evidence)
   - increased joint activities (research, study groups, etc.)

3. What do you hope will happen? The checklist above may or may not address the institutional changes you hope to see. What specifically do you hope for in the context of your situation?

4. What will it take to bring about the kind of changes you hope for?
   A. What do you see as the roadblocks?
   B. What is helping, or could help overcome those roadblocks?
   C. Who are the necessary players?

APPENDIX B

THE LEARNING/TEACHING COLLABORATIVE

BROOKLINE'S NATIONALLY ACCLAIMED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Mission

The Learning/Teaching Collaborative is a Professional Development Schools (PDS) program committed to the partnerships among schools and colleges that create enhanced learning/teaching environments for children and graduate interns, and for classroom teachers and college faculty. These partnerships enable the creation and use of professional knowledge that builds understandings about good practice and promotes the transformation of educational institutions to better serve children and enhance the professional development of educators.

History

The Brookline-based Learning/Teaching Collaborative (L/TC) was established in 1987 as a Professional Development School under a Massachusetts State Grant. Its objective was to improve educational opportunities for elementary school students in the Brookline Public Schools, while reforming preservice teacher education at Wheelock College. In 1990, a U.S. Department of Education grant from the Fund for Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching helped expand the collaboration to include the Boston Public Schools and Simmons College in Boston.

The collaboration has received national attention for:

- Serving a diverse student population
- Enhancing the professional development of teachers
- Providing new roles for classroom teachers
- Reforming teacher education

As a nationally recognized model of preservice/inservice collaboration between public schools and colleges, L/TC is one of the oldest and most successful programs of its kind in the United States.

How L/TC Helps Brookline Deliver on its Commitment to Core Values

High Academic Achievement. L/TC develops and promulgates high standards of educational excellence among teachers and interns. The Collaborative has worked to restructure learning environments to provide increased educational opportunities for students and teachers.

As part of a continuing effort to develop stronger district commitments to the PDS, Vivian Troen has prepared this document specifically listing how the Learning/Teaching Collaborative helps Brookline meet its core goals and how the Collaborative benefits the students, teachers and parents of the town.

Excellence in Teaching. L/TC institutes rigorous teacher-training curricula and follows up with close supervision, team building, and mentoring. Teachers participate in ongoing professional development activities as part of their work in L/TC.

Collaborative Relationships. L/TC's focus on teachers working in teams supports collaborative relationships among teachers and parents. L/TC improves communication and coordination among all members of the school/college partnership.

Respect for Human Differences. L/TC promotes integrated classroom services such as special education, ESL, and others that address diversity in the classroom. L/TC actively seeks minority interns' participation in the program.

A Pioneering Approach Becomes a Successful Model. "We believe the uniqueness of your program provides a model worthy of replication throughout the nation." -National Center for Innovation, National Education Association

Now in its ninth year, the Learning/Teaching Collaborative has grown from one school team of three classroom teachers and a half-time special education teacher to teams of teachers in six Brookline and Boston public schools, working in partnership with Wheelock and Simmons Colleges.

Four major components provide the framework for the Collaborative:

Team Teaching. Teams of teachers and their interns share curriculum and children. Five hours per month are allocated for team meetings outside the school day. In addition, principals have arranged common planning time for teachers so that teachers, their interns, and the college supervisor can meet on a regular basis.

School/University Collaboration. Graduate student interns from Wheelock College or Simmons College work full-time in the teams during the entire school year. A teacher and college faculty member teach the Wheelock interns' graduate level curriculum seminar together; other teachers present guest lectures on their particular areas of expertise; and a number of classroom teachers teach reading and math methods courses at the two colleges.

A Steering Committee composed of college and school faculty members, interns, and administrators from each of the participating institutions governs the Collaborative and meets four times per year. Subcommittees meet throughout the year to handle budget, recruitment of interns, the professional development of teachers, parent involvement, and public relations.

Special Education Inclusion. In a number of the teams special needs children are fully mainstreamed. Special Education teachers are members of the teams; they consult with teachers and give some direct service to children.

Alternative Professional Teaching Time. Each classroom teacher may take up to one day a week away from teaching duties to assume alternative roles such as curriculum writer, researcher, or student-teacher supervisor/college teacher. This "Alternative Professional Time" (APT) is facilitated by the full-time presence of teaching interns.

Improving Teaching, Classrooms and Schools Enriches the Brookline School System

Benefits to the School System. The Learning/Teaching Collaborative enhances the ability of the Brookline Public School system to build internal capacity and to improve itself.

Graduates from the L/TC program infuse the Brookline Public Schools with highly qualified new teachers. The immediate benefit to Brookline is that the system receives, at novice teachers' salaries, teachers who are already experienced in the Brookline system and whose work is of proven quality. Graduates are now teaching in several Brookline elementary schools. L/TC graduates are highly sought after by other school systems. The placement rate is close to 100%.

Alternate Professional Teaching time allows teachers to engage in numerous educational enterprises. This unique component of the program gives teachers the ability to engage in numerous professional development and community-building activities. Because of this, Brookline is able to capitalize on teacher commitment to serve on townwide curriculum committees and statewide curriculum frameworks committees. Teachers also develop and attend seminars involved with the implementation of new mandated curricula.

Three teachers in the Collaborative are involved in a multi-year project with TERC, Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC) and Summer Math at Mt. Holyoke College, to strengthen their own mathematical understandings and investigate ways their own students understand math. APT time has enabled them to work directly with students on math research, reflect and write about their findings, and serve on the Brookline mathematics curriculum committee for grades 1-5. They are sharing their experiences and knowledge in math seminars for Brookline teachers.

APT time has made it possible for an L/TC language arts teacher to participate in the development of the Massachusetts English/Language Arts Curriculum Framework, spending two full days each month working with other curriculum framers. His participation in the process ensures that Brookline's point of view is heard at the state level. This gives teachers access to his knowledge as they prepare for the coming state guidelines.

L/TC teachers engage in action-based teacher research. Teacher research encourages classroom teachers to investigate and inform their own practice, which in turn has ramifications for teacher improvement as these teachers mentor other teachers. As a result, students receive the benefits of teachers sharing their experiences with the latest curriculum and instructional practice. In a number of schools, L/TC teachers are peer coaching colleagues in the implementation of the new curriculum.

Brookline teachers are on the cutting edge of education. As teachers involved in L/TC assume greater leadership, they become pro- active spokespeople in the educational community bringing added value to the school system. All L/TC members benefit from college coursework disseminated by interns. Some teachers share their expertise in curriculum and instruction by teaching courses at the colleges. In Brookline, teachers are indeed changing the way future educators are being prepared.

An L/TC teacher who derives great satisfaction in mentoring new teachers is sought out for her expertise by her principal and by others in the Collaborative. Last year she mentored a staff member at one school who was having difficulty changing her practice; this past year she has mentored two new sixth grade teachers in two different schools.

L/TC brings national attention to Brookline as an educational leader. As Brookline's reputation in the larger education community expands, recognition grows among the most prestigious national educational organizations and institutions. The Learning/Teaching Collaborative draws visitors from across the country (and abroad) to learn about this model.

L/TC has been studied and cited as an outstanding PDS site by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools and Teaching, the National Network for Educational Renewal, and the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning.

L/TC teachers, recognized for the value of their participation in the Collaborative, are invited to present papers at national conferences; most recently the American Education Research Association, the National Board for the Professionalization of Teaching Standards, and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

The National Education Association has singled out L/TC for an award, citing the Collaborative's achievement as an Exemplary Schools Program "worthy of replication throughout the nation."

Benefits to the School. Overall, the presence of interns increases the number of school staff. Scheduling can be more flexible. Communication among classroom teachers, specialists, and parents is improved. The presence of interns reduces the need for aides. At some schools, the homework center is staffed by interns. Interns provide additional assistance at various school activities.

L/TC reduces teacher turnover. Experienced, highly qualified teachers whose morale has been raised, and who are finding new and exciting challenges in their work are less likely to look elsewhere for better opportunities. Parent response is overwhelmingly positive. Over the years they have shown strong support for the internship program.

Benefits to the Classroom. In the L/TC model there are usually two qualified teachers in the classroom. The benefits are both financial and educational. There is rarely a need to hire a substitute when a teacher is absent (an average saving of $500 per year per L/TC teacher), and there is continuity in classwork. In addition, teaching methods and skills improve for both teachers and interns as a result of the close interaction among teachers, interns, and college faculty.

Benefits to the Students. L/TC increases the number of services and benefits to students. Lowering the adult/student ratio means each student receives more individual attention, more stimulation, more variety of educational experience. Research shows that students in the program are more likely to connect with teachers and their classmates, and are collaborating and cooperating more than students in other settings. Special needs students have shown significant improvement on CAT scores.

Benefits to the Teacher and the Profession. L/TC provides more support for the teacher in the classroom, increases teacher morale, builds the professional knowledge base, puts excellent teachers into the field, and raises the level of teacher professionalization. It provides teachers with an opportunity to be affiliated with outstanding colleges and to take on other professional roles without giving up classroom teaching. There are also the additional educational and psychological benefits of working with a team of colleagues in a stimulating venture of educational reform.

APPENDIX C

SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

For each "Sign of Institutionalization" assess where your partnership is, using the scale of 1-5, with 1 as not present, 5 as well-institutionalized and NA for items that seem not applicable in your context. Use the space below to list a few of the indicators that give evidence to support your assessment.

Indicators:

1. The PDS is integral to the partnership and to the operation of both the school and the college or university; the PDS is used in job descriptions, course catalogs, integrated into the core values, culture, and attitudes and, in general, is "woven into the fabric" of participating institutions

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

2. A critical mass of persons from participating institutions, including those with leadership and authority, is involved in the PDS.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

3. A governance structure is present that engages the voices of faculty members and other staff and administrators in ways that allow for ownership, continuity, communication, vitality, and commitment.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

4. Adequate resources are available at participating institutions, including a budget line and a schedule that permits staffs from the respective institutions to focus on issues and work pertaining to the PDS during their regular workday.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

5. Professional development regularly takes place that acknowledges new roles for all the professionals involved in a PDS (pre- and inservice teachers as well as other professionals—counselors, administrators, etc.) at the school and the college, and is conducted in a mutually beneficial and reciprocal way through the PDS.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

6. The reward system at participating institutions, including salary, incentives, promotion, and tenure, reflects the importance of PDS work.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

Indicators:

7. Assessment processes provide for ongoing inquiry in and on the PDS to ensure that institutionalization not only leads to new structures and policies that appear to be innovative, but ones that actually improve the learning of students and teachers; assessment processes need to incorporate follow-up procedures that make sure the PDS is meeting the original or evolving mission and goals for the partnership. Assessment is also key to locating and sustaining stable funding and support from outside funders and from decision makers at the district and college levels.

   1 2 3 4 5 NA

The Cultural and Community Politics of Educational Equity: Toward a New Framework of Professional Development Schools

Peter C. Murrell, Jr. and Mario Borunda

> The school culture is like that of any other major social institution—it's political in the narrow and general sense of that word, i.e., the behavior of people—students, teachers, administrators, parents—and the stability and transformations in classrooms, and school system structures have to be seen in terms of the seeking, allocation, and uses of power. Introducing, sustaining, and assessing an educational change are political processes because they inevitably alter or threaten to alter existing power relationships especially if that process implies, as it almost always does, a reallocation of resources. Few myths have been as resistant to change as that which assumes that the culture of the school is a nonpolitical one, and few myths have contributed as much to the failure of the change effort.
>
> Seymour Sarason
> (1996, p. 70)

INTRODUCTION

The idea of the professional development school (PDS) has occupied a prominent place in school reform movements in recent years. The concept is viewed by many (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1992; Goodlad, 1988, 1994; Lieberman & Miller, 1990; The Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; The Carnegie Forum, 1986) as a special case of school restructuring, whereby new models of teacher education, professional development, innovative instruction, and program building would emerge from relationships between college and university partners on one hand, and public schools and school departments on the other. In the last decade, a proliferation of PDSs has helped to make the primary aims commonplace, namely: (1) increased school effectiveness through professional development of its faculty; (2) development of quality preservice teacher education; and (3) collaborative research and development on teaching and learning. PDS advocates have hailed the PDS model as the engine of school reform, capable of transforming schools into places "...where teachers can learn from each other ..." and where "...children will learn more...." (The Holmes Group, 1986, p. 4).

Despite the enthusiasm of its advocates, however, we believe that there are serious questions about whether PDSs can deliver substantially on that promise in the absence of a reform agenda that is explicitly addressed to the significant equity issues that determine the day-to-day quality of life in schools for millions of children of color. The PDS movement is already embedded in a complex web of inherently flawed social contexts, issues, and dilemmas, and therefore the plan and focused energy to confront and contend with issues of equity must be explicitly stated. While the advocates of the PDS concept espouse a commitment to educational equity, the PDS movement itself has not produced, in either theory or practice, a systematic agenda for addressing the social, cultural, and political contexts of equity as these are played out in the life of schools, particularly those schools located in under-resourced urban communities. Given the lack of such a systematic agenda, is the PDS framework capable of transforming schools into places where poor children of color can excel?

We take this to be a serious question of the utmost urgency and seriousness. As educators and researchers of color (Peter C. Murrell, Jr. is Black and Mario Borunda is Hispanic), we are deeply concerned about the cultural politics of current movements in both school renewal and teacher preparation—the twin agendas of the professional development schools framework. We worry that without an equity agenda that is specifically focused on the lived experiences of children in actual school contexts, teacher educators, reformers, and policymakers will continually lose sight of what, ironically, is one of the guiding principles of the PDS concept—promoting educational equity. To date, the PDS movement has failed to live up to the promise of ameliorating inequalities in the learning environments of children in public schools. The first worry we call "the unkept promise."

Our second worry is that the current PDS framework is not likely to yield an equity agenda that really addresses the needs of urban communities. In the climate of current reform agendas that, historically, have threatened equity considerations—in particular, the standards movement and the nationalization of teacher assessment—it is unclear whether equity issues can ever adequately be addressed within the PDS framework. It will take our best thinking to ensure that the new iterations of the PDS idea do not become a hegemonic presence with respect to alternate collaborative arrangements that more essentially address equity issues.

Our purpose in this essay is to begin the conversation to stimulate our best thinking on the question of how the PDS framework can successfully address the deep and fundamental issues of educational equality. In the first part of this essay, we elaborate and examine briefly our two worries mentioned above—the "unkept promise" and the lack of a clearly articulated equity agenda. In the second part of this essay we describe conditions under which equity might become a viable dimension in the work of professional development partnerships and collaborations. In this description we are explicit about our two worries (stated above) that must be addressed if the PDS framework is to successfully address equity issues. Finally, we describe the conditions and essential features that must be incorporated in an equity-minded PDS collaboration.

One important distinction we strive to make throughout this essay is that between the PDS concept and the PDS movement. It is not the PDS idea that is inherently flawed. It is the PDS movement and the current operationalizing of the PDS idea that is flawed with respect to effectively reversing historical patterns of educational inequality. Without a critical perspective on the PDS idea as it is instantiated in the current school reform movements, the hegemonic presence of the prevailing PDS model will continue to give short shrift to improving student achievement and developing innovative practices for teaching and learning in urban schools.

We advocate strongly for a systemic interrogation of the role that public schools, the current reform movements, and bureaucratic structures (like PDSs) play in the perpetuation of societal stratification and social inequities. Without this critical perspective, it will be impossible for PDSs to formulate and operationalize an equity agenda that gets to the root of educational inequality. A movement that does not systematically question its fundamental assumptions, values, and goals will undoubtedly contribute to the perpetuation of educational inequality.

THE UNKEPT PROMISE AND THE EQUITY AGENDA

In the PDS movement there is a growing expectation that a dynamic collaboration between schools and higher education will result from PDS partnerships, which is supposed to lead, in turn, to systemic school renewal and educational reform (Darling-Hammond, 1994). PDSs are viewed as means of providing "a context for thinking and reinventing schools for the purpose of building and sustaining the best educational practice" (Lieberman & Miller, 1990, p. 759). The enthusiasm for the PDS as the preferred model of educational reform is evidenced by the proliferation of collaboratives that call themselves PDSs throughout the country, and also by the subsequent attempts to disseminate PDS standards to distinguish those collaborative partnerships that are "truly PDSs" (e.g., Darling-Hammond, 1992; Levine, 1996; Sykes, 1997). With this growing expectation and enthusiasm comes the danger, pointed out by Larabee and Pallas (1996), that the PDS model will become the litmus test for "the good teacher preparation program" thereby privileging a narrower range of research and professional activity.

The prominence of the PDS idea in the educational literature as the model of educational reform has, from our perspective, disturbing consequences with respect to equity issues. Educational equity is supposed to be one of the guiding principles of professional development schools. Yet, 20 years after the inception of the PDS concept, there is painfully little commitment to equity (Teitel, 1996; cf. Valli, Cooper, and Frankes, 1997). For example, consider two of the four equity initiatives directly related to teacher preparation for which The Holmes Partnership (Irvine, n.d.) sought and received funding:

1. to create a more racially diverse university community and to prepare additional persons of color in teaching and the teaching profession;
2. to increase the size and quantity of graduate professional education programs that have substantial numbers of faculty and students who are persons of color (p. 2).

While we think these were extremely worthwhile in light of changes that needed to be pursued in higher education, the fact is that despite the best efforts of The Holmes Partnership (e.g., Holmes Scholars Program) and other PDS advocates, the number of people of color in the teaching profession has steadily diminished over the last two decades. Therefore, despite the enthusiasm for what promise PDSs had for the "reinventing of schools" to include more people of color, the reality is that there has been little, if any, progress made toward achievement of those goals.

While the advocates of the PDS concept have advanced valuable ideas and principles regarding what Cuban (1988) termed second-order change, the movement itself has not produced, in either theory or practice, systematic ways of addressing equity issues that are reflected in improved experiences of teaching and learning for children. The promise that the PDS models will help transform public schools into multicultural democratic learning communities has not been kept. We are not the first to note the failure of the PDS movement to live up to the promise of addressing inequalities in the learning environments of children (cf., Foster, 1992; Irvine, n.d.), but we are perhaps the first to contend that *this failure is congenitally rooted in the professional development schools model itself.* We see this congenital inability for PDSs to deal with equity issues rooted in three problems:

1. PDSs are not designed to address the underlying political questions that produce inequities in schooling.
2. The PDS framework as it currently exists yields conceptually narrow, culturally uncritical, and politically disingenuous definitions of equity.
3. The process of realizing a PDS is hyper-political with respect to reproducing the idea of PDS, but apolitical with respect to the real needs, interests, and agendas of communities supposedly served by PDSs.

We will briefly examine each of these problems in turn.

First, there is nothing inherent in the PDS framework, or any framework for that matter, that addressees the gritty issues of equity in the improvement of teaching and learning as they relate to the reallocation of power, resources, or capacity. It is arguably unreasonable to expect an organizational approach that focuses on professional development to yield strategies for successfully addressing issues of equity in schools. On this account, we would not expect immediate and tangible impacts to trickle down to demonstrable improvements in classroom teaching and learning. We would accede to this argument if it were not for the fact that operationalizing the commitment to equity was supposed to be one of the guiding principles of professional development schools. Moreover, the model continues to privilege the "tooling up of the professionals" (teachers) over developing capacity of schools, communities, families and other stakeholders to improve the educational experiences of children.

The second problem concerns the narrow, apolitical definitions and concepts of equity. PDSs currently operate with an unexamined, depoliticized, and contextually rootless conception of educational equity. In PDS literature, equity is typically conceived only in terms of the access to, and distribution of, educational resources with respect to a "minority" or "nonmainstream" population. This conventional view of equity as "equality of opportunity and access" appears in PDS literature evaluating the success in terms of greater material resources for the "educationally disadvantaged" student—usually meaning Black, Hispanic, and other children of color.

Associated with this conventional view of equity as "equality of opportunity and access" is the notion of diversity as an array of differences owing to the representations of race, ethnicity, culture, and national origin within a population of students. With this confluence of "access" and "difference," the resulting default formulation of equity among PDS initiatives has been that of providing "disadvantaged children" with the same access to educational resources as their more privileged white, middle-class peers. While this conception of equity holds an important place in the history of the struggle for educational opportunity and civic justice in America, it is an anachronistic and inappropriate framework change on behalf of children of color.

The PDS default view of equity—that of balanced access and opportunity to educational resources—has as its historical roots the Brown vs. Board of Education ruling in 1954 in which the Supreme Court reasoned that "separate" was inherently "unequal"—a ruling that carried with it the implication that lack of access of African American children to the same experiences and resources as their white counterparts was *prima facie* evidence of unequal education. For better or worse, in the ensuing 40 years much of the work toward achieving educational equity followed an agenda of "sameness" and "balance" in the equal educational treatment of children of color. The best this agenda has to offer attempts to achieve greater equity within the PDS movement; that is, to endeavor that children from diverse cultural, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds have access to the same educational benefits that might accrue to a school program by virtue of the collaboration. But sameness is not a good measure of desirability.

These standards and definitions of PDSs apply such a narrow conception of equity that the PDS movement has no destination with regard to reversing educational inequality. As a result, most public schools will continue to fail to educate poor children of color. Conceptualizing equity only in terms of distribution and amount of resources (e.g., numbers of teachers of color, books, and computers) narrows the equity agenda to concerns that fall far short of addressing the roots of educational inequality. The destination for equity has to be defined by needs and issues as seen from the perspective of community partners if it is to be responsive to schools and communities. But the current structure of the professional development school, as we understand it, does not suggest an equal partnership or participation by the wider community of stakeholders in the success of the public school.

We turn now to the third problem and our claim that the processes of realizing PDSs is hyper-political with regard to the PDS structure, but apolitical with regard to the culture, interests, and needs of the schools and communities ostensibly served. To explain why the institution of the professional development school is unlikely to yield service that is fully responsive to urban communities with respect to equity issues, we must first briefly elucidate the context change in teacher education. The point we wish to illustrate is that PDSs are negotiating the politics of their existence within a context where teacher education is coming increasingly under fire. The agenda sustaining the PDS idea is rarely in congruence with—more likely at odds with—negotiating the politics of equity on behalf of poor children and children of color in urban communities.

In these times of educational reform, there is good reason for the professionalization of teaching to be politically charged. The story of teacher preparation in the last few decades has been one of an entity struggling with its marginalization within the academy on the one hand, and the growing sense of its irrelevancy to the practical needs of teachers and teaching on the other hand (e.g., Goodlad, 1991; Hargreaves, 1994, 1995; Sarason, 1993). Hargreaves (1995) argues that the institutions of teacher education have responded in three ways:

1. by attempts to develop a new canon of knowledge and a scientific knowledge base in order to elevate the status of teacher education and educational research to a par equal to other disciplines in the academy;
2. by attempts to deinstitutionalize teacher preparation and dissipating its presence in the academy and relocating it in schools, rooting its authority of knowledge more in the "wisdom of practice" of clinical experience, and less in the university sphere;
3. by attempts to create professional development schools—"safely simulated" contractual partnerships between university schools of education and public schools, centering the collaboration on the improvement of teaching practice through the professional development of teachers.

In the United States, the PDS has been the most prominent response. The emergence of the PDS as the predominant approach to school reform and professional renewal has powerful implications for the capacity of American schools to seriously address educational equity. It is important to critically re-examine the PDS idea precisely because it threatens to become the modal, dominant, and (dare we say) hegemonic framework for school reform in the future (Report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, 1996). What other truly equity-responsive approaches based upon local purposes and capacity-building have we abandoned in our embrace of the PDS? How effective can our equity work be when it is driven more by organizational structuring than by community mobilization around a common valued purpose—quality education?

Hargreaves (1995) writes: "For many teacher educators, professional development schools are treasured microcosms - small worlds that embed principles of preferred practice among teacher educators in terms of classroom teaching and learning, teacher preparation, organizational improvement and field based research" (p. 29). This echoes Sarason's (1993) cogent critique that PDSs best illustrate only how to create a new school, not how to reform an existing one. The result has been that the drive for PDSs comes more from an imperative for institution-building than from a response to unequal education. In short, institutional structure is privileged over political purpose.

According to Hargreaves (1995), educators in our postmodern era create and construct a new symbol for who they are and what they do. He argues that when networks and people's activities spread more diffusely across space, people set about creating and attaching themselves to particularities of place. He means that the PDS is the created space—the symbol if you will—where right-minded, progressive teachers go to invest purpose and meaning. This is where teachers and teacher educators sort of hunker down into their own created space—created of necessity to hide from the crossfire of claims of irrelevancy to teachers and teaching from practitioners on the one hand, and the claim that teacher education is not a legitimate discipline in the academy on the other.

What we advocate here is a critical interrogation of the PDS structure in light of Hargreaves' (1995) notion of the "symbolic encapsulation" of teacher education and the profession of teaching. At issue is how the PDSs too often become the emblem of all that is progressive, innovative, desirable, and forward-thinking in regard to schooling to the exclusion of alternative partnership relationships that might be more effective. Our approach requires interrogation of the PDS idea in order to rupture the hegemony of the model.

An equity agenda can only be developed by confronting the ways in which bureaucratic structures take preeminence over political purposes regarding educational equity.

This sort of interrogation is not easy to do, and is particularly difficult in the complex PDS work of relationship-building between institutional partners. Critical perspective is easily lost in the tyranny of the mundane—where the everyday demands of putting out "brush fires," acquiring materials, and just "keeping things going" leave little time or energy for the critical reflection necessary to avoid privileging structure over purpose.

We contend that the only guarantee against the tyranny of the mundane is to put the development of other things ahead of the PDS structure—community initiative for building capacity based on mutually agreed-upon purposes from that community. Hargreaves (1995) proposes a fourth model consistent with this idea, in which "the contributions of universities and faculties of education might be most useful if they drew on the university's distinctive skills of research, inquiry, and critical reflection and used these to work with partners in school systems to change the contexts in which teachers work and students learn" (p. 33). On this account, all university-based people who care about education bring the best of what they have to offer—traditions of research and intellectual inquiry, critical reflection and teaching in many disciplines, and a commitment to social change—and recognize that they do not unilaterally bring the agenda for improving schools.

For the above stated reasons, the PDS concept as it currently is formulated cannot articulate a clear vision of educational equity. While the PDS movement is very clear on preservice and inservice teacher development, it offers, in our view, little with regard to changing practices relevant to educational equity. We contend that the destination for the PDS equity agenda cannot be set unilaterally, but must be based instead on participation of the communities, schools, neighborhoods, and families that are affected by the partnership. It is to this redefinition of equity, and an equity-oriented professional development schema, that we now turn.

TOWARD A NEW APPROACH TO EQUITY THROUGH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

What would an equity-minded professional development school partnership look like? We have listed below nine features that we would expect to find in an equity-minded professional development collaboration of university and school partners, and summarized them in Table 1 (see page 83). These features derive from a critical look at the social, cultural, historical, and political contexts of the schools we work in (and with and for), armed with a critical perspective dedicated to learning from the shortcomings of models already in existence (especially our own). Here are the nine features we need to consider in moving toward equity-minded PDS work.

1. **A "Quality of Education" Perspective**—Conceiving of "equity" in terms of whether teaching and learning produce the effects of quality education— namely,

clear and demonstrable increases in academic achievement, personal development, and civic sensibilities. The perspective entails critically reinterpreting the meaning of equity as Dewey pragmatists, Freire theorists-activists, and Vygotsky epistemologists.

2. **A "Collaborative, Multilateral Partnership" Perspective** —Being open to developing a collaborative structure involving community constituency—parents and parent organizations, community agencies that work with the same children, and other stakeholders.

3. **A "Development of Communities" Perspective**—Expanding the professional development agenda to the development of leadership and expertise among parents, school personnel, agency personnel, and most important, the children themselves.

4. **An "Expanded Teacher Development" Perspective**—Expanding the professional development agenda beyond classroom teaching to entertaining the new roles required in systemic problem solving. This means designing teacher preparation and development according to mutually determined qualities for effective teaching and learning both for students and for professionals.

5. **A "Scholar-Teacher" Perspective**—Teacher preparation focused on a new and different kind of teacher who recognizes, understands, and effectively negotiates complexities of urban communities that affect children's learning and development.

6. **A "Relationships Over Bureaucracies" Perspective**—Addressing the issues that people in the community want to see, not merely focusing on those problems that university folks think they can solve. Relationships organize the structure of the collaborative work, not bureaucratic structure.

7. **An "Expanded Roles" Perspective**—Refusal to look at parents only as parents, but as potential teachers, advisors, policymakers, teacher-trainers, etc.

8. **A "Community as Network of Relationships" Perspective**—A sense of "we-ness," a sense of a social-collaborative entity consisting of university people, neighborhood people, and school people committed to children and to each other in the project of developing children.

9. **A "Joint Responsibility and Accountability" Perspective**—University responsibility—university and college partners sharing the responsibility for the gains in academic achievement and personal development of children in those communities, and accountability for lack of progress.

In this final section we will develop each of these features into recommendations for reformulating an equity agenda in the context of this new professional development paradigm summarized in Table 1.

A "Quality of Education" Perspective

Critical interrogation of the conception of "educational equity" is the most important developmental task for equity-minded PDSs. Rarely, if ever, have we seen in the PDS literature an interrogation as to whether those new material resources, curricular innovations, and new instructional approaches actually lead to enhanced learning achievement and development among children of color. Limiting equity to structural and resource matters narrows the agenda considerably. Added to this is the problem of the anachronistic and politically disingenuous conceptions of equity in the PDS framework. Without a critical reinterpretation of what we mean by "equity" from the perspective of communities striving to achieve it, the PDS literature will continue to define equity in terms of a "disadvantaged other" who is designated "disadvantaged" only by virtue of not having access to the material resources, curricular innovations, and improved instruction the PDS is supposed to generate.

The most important feature we would expect to find in an equity-minded PDS is a constant interrogation of the meaning of equity in the social, cultural, and political context of our times and of the community. We believe in a rigorous critical pedagogy (in the Freirean sense) in thinking about how we, as university people, enter into partnership with school communities. Critical pedagogy is a perspective that acknowledges that we do not fully know what to do and to think until we couple our doing and thinking with a process of joint public discourse and community building. In a new approach to an equity-minded collaborative partnership with schools and communities, we ought to be Dewey pragmatists, Freire theorists-activists, and Vygotsky epistemologists.

As Dewey pragmatists we mean, first of all, that we learn from solving problems and reflecting on our actions in true collaboration with teachers, principals, parents, children, and other school-community stakeholders. As we understand Dewey, the central principle is that human beings develop their innate capacity for intelligent thought and action. Human beings develop this capacity of intelligence, when through thought, action, and reflection, they confront the myriad of perplexing and complex problems they face in their daily lives, and when they reflect on this experience to amplify the efficacy of their thought and action. Therefore, however we enter formal agreements, our common enterprise with partners must be grounded in shared experience and responsibility, in action and reflective thought in our real endeavors to solve real problems in real communities.

What it means to be Freirean theorists-activists is that the real problem solving must be situated in a particular context of human relationships—specifically, a community. Our research, our theory, and our program development must be closely linked to our everyday practical activities of community development. As we understand Freire, this means the elimination of "helperism" in our relationship to our partners in urban communities, and working with them on their enterprises of change. This means that as we conduct research and build theory, we have to use the resulting understandings to develop hypotheses and test them in the crucible of effective work on that common enterprise of change, and then reflect on the effectiveness of our theory-guided actions to generate new hypotheses that guide our theory building and research.

The other sense in which we urge that PDS people be Dewey pragmatists and Freire theorists-activists concerns the appropriate role of the higher education partners. The broader purpose of higher education in the life of urban communities ought to be as a participant in transforming these communities, as the means of changing society toward becoming a truly just, multicultural democracy. So, for our work the real problem-solving context is building community on a multiplicity of levels involved in the simultaneous tasks of community development in urban sites and interdepartmental and inter-institutional collaboration among higher education partners.

Third, we urge PDS workers to become Vygotskian epistemologists in the critical re-examination of the psychological, cultural, and sociological theory of human development and education. This means that we are mindful of the importance of understanding the social, political, historical, and cultural contexts of people with whom, and for whom, we work. Most important, being Vygotskian epistemologists means that the notion of development—both in and of social contexts—is the core of our theoretical and practical work. A large part of the theoretical work within our disciplines is a critical interpretation of the existing body of research and theory on human development and human learning in light of its utility, efficacy, and appropriateness for working with children, families, and neighborhoods in urban communities.

It is beyond dispute that public schooling in America is a socializing force serving to recreate social stratification. American educators have been very slow to recognize the role schooling plays in maintaining and replicating an undemocratic hierarchical social order—to reproduce disparities of wealth, cultural dominance, and unequal political relationships between groups and classes (cf. Bordieu & Passeron, 1977; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Freire, 1993; Woodson, 1933). It is therefore imperative, given the cultural and racial politics of American schooling, that educational advocacy on behalf of children of color be capable of critically interrogating the institutions, foundations, and practices of the *status quo*.

Advocates for these children must be prepared to be, in fact, fundamentally subversive at particular junctures where the interests of children are opposed by the interests of schooling bureaucracies (Murrell, 1997). However, what needs to be subverted in a broader sense are the structures and practices of domination and oppression that stand in the way of education as the practice of critical democracy. This means, for example, that university people may need to take stances that oppose the interests of the school partners and school bureaucracies—such as instituting a program of standardized testing that is destined to ruin any opportunity for a coherent, rich curriculum—if they truly advocate for the educational quality of children.

The first recommendation is to shift the political focus from "equality of schooling" or everyone-gets-the-same perspective, to a "quality of teaching and learning" or a schooling-that-makes-a-real-difference perspective. By this we mean that effective redress to issues of educational inequality require that we understand schooling in historical, cultural, and political contexts. On this account, we would no longer look at equity merely in terms of "racial balance" or equivalent numbers of books and computers, but primarily in terms of effect—whether children's curricular experiences and scholastic achievement are actually improved.

This redefinition is consistent with a growing consensus among African American educators that an important distinction between schooling and education must be drawn in the case of African Americans in the United States. According to this growing consensus among African American scholars, educators, and historians, schooling is "the process intended to perpetuate and maintain society's existing power relations and the institutional structures that support those arrangements" (Shujaa, 1994, p. 14). Education, on the other hand, is a process that prepares the young to understand themselves in relation to others and to provide the emotional, social, and intellectual tools to act meaningfully and ethically in the world.

From the perspective of many African American communities that send their children to public schools, the equity issue is, to use the words of Mwalimu Shujaa (1994), "too much schooling, and too little education" (p. 15). In particular, these parents are keenly aware of the difference between schooling practices and the actual development of their children. They note that the schooling systems work quite well—particularly those that suspend their children, refer them to special education classes, and document their low aptitudes. But as an educational system, public schools clearly do not work for their children in terms of resulting in increases in academic achievement and development of scholastic proficiency.

A "Collaborative, Multilateral Partnership" Perspective

The second feature we would expect to find in an equity-minded professional development collaboration is more than one university or college partner working with a given school, and finding ways to operate as teams in the instructional goals and tasks of the school. The second recommendation is to look at alternative ways of structuring partnering relationships to the bilateral school-university partnership of the PDS model. Rather than allowing the structure (i.e., the PDS model) to dictate the tasks (inservice and preservice development), we ought to allow the needs, interests, and ongoing agendas of the school communities to determine a collaborative agenda.

It is our recommendation that in the work of building relationships, university partners privilege community commitments, purposes, and goals over bureaucratic structures and agreements. For example, what good is the university people's insistence on "more innovative curriculum" when public school teachers, like the miller's daughter in the folktale Rumplestiltskin, are struggling with the task of spinning the straw of the Citywide Learning Standards into the gold of excellent, coherent curriculum?

A "Development of Communities" Perspective

The third recommendation is that an equity-minded PDS would regard children, families, and communities as its primary commitment—not schools or school administrations. In contrast to the conventional PDS model in which bilateral partnerships are established between university and school personnel, the equity-minded PDS would seek a multilateral, multipartnered collaborative in which all individuals with an interest, commitment, and connection with the children in that community work together. Why is this orientation important? Without a commitment to the educational achievement and personal development of a community of children, it is too easy for the interests of institutions and bureaucracies to supersede the needs of children.

Our recommendation is to shift the locus of development. Rather than focusing only on the professional development of teachers, the expertise and leadership capacities of parents, youth workers, and children should be developed as well. In the development of expertise on the use of the Internet for example, there is no reason why all members of a school community should not develop expertise together for the common enterprise of supporting children's learning.

An "Expanded Teacher Preparation and Development" Perspective

A fourth feature we would expect to find in an equity-minded PDS collaborative is a teacher education agenda that looks beyond the lament of "we're stuck with a nearly all-white, culturally mainstream corps of teachers so how are we going to prepare them for successful teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse urban settings" and take seriously one of the original PDS goals of addressing representation of teachers of color in the teaching profession. This expanded agenda involves critical attention to the "standards" movement and the "national assessment of teachers" agenda in relationship to how they threaten this equity goal. It will also involve putting into place initiatives that address that goal, such as those described below.

In the midst of national conversations regarding how to improve increasingly diverse and under-resourced urban public schools, children of color in urban school systems continue to be miseducated to an alarming extent. For example, African American children in virtually every large city school system, particularly males, fare less well than their European American counterparts. African American children are disproportionately expelled, suspended, and relegated to special programs for the emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, and mentally retarded. They have dramatically higher dropout rates, yet dramatically lower grade-point averages and rates of matriculation. These are realities that school communities, particularly parents and community stakeholders, are most interested in addressing—an agenda that will rarely place "professional development" as a higher priority.

What are teachers learning that will make them more capable to face these challenges of the 21st century? Are we going to settle for trying to make a predominantly white, culturally mainstream corps of teachers suffice? Or are we going to take advantage of the opportunity to replace the aging, retiring current corps of teachers with young, effective, responsive teachers who may be white, but understand and appreciate urban communities? What are we doing to guarantee the development of teachers of color, since we (PDSs, Carnegie, Holmes) have identified that as an important goal? Have we given up on it or are we going to be proactive about it? These are questions that are addressed in relation to this fourth feature of the new PDS.

A "Scholar-Teacher" Perspective

A fifth feature we would expect to find in an equity-minded PDS collaborative is a focus on visioning and developing a new kind of teacher for effectively meeting the challenges of successful work in urban schools and communities in the 21st century. Teacher preparation focused on a new and different kind of teacher who recognizes, understands, and effectively negotiates complexities of urban communities that have a significant impact on children's learning and development. There has never been a more critical time of need in the history of the United States for teachers who can envision and work toward effective, safe, and strong public schools. John Dewey once said that our public schools are the laboratories for democracy.

To face the challenges of the new century, public schools will truly need the "best and the brightest" to revitalize our nation's communities and public life. We know that "best and brightest" as it has been conventionally defined in the sort-and-select paradigm of American public education is not the new kind of educator we will need for the future. The children of many cultures who make up today's city classrooms need caring, capable, and knowledgeable teachers who thrive on the richness and potential of multicultural, multiracial urban communities. We recommend the notion of the scholar-teacher embodying teaching expertise in five areas: (1) both subject matter mastery in a discipline and pedagogical expertise; (2) synthesis of both theory and practice of teaching; (3) interdisciplinary curriculum; (4) deep understanding of the social, cultural, political, and historical contexts of urban education; and (5) the ability to expertly negotiate teaching in urban schools.

Program development in an equity-minded professional development school should be characterized by: (1) candidates who acquire and demonstrate expertise in a specific discipline; (2) a rigorous development program in the theory and practice of urban education conducted while the candidate is actively teaching in the classroom; (3) acquisition of an insider's understanding and expertise for stewarding the development of young people in urban communities as well as programs of community education and development; (4) an ongoing, working relationship with three or more community-based organizations that focus on the education and development of urban youth; (5) mentoring of candidates to develop culturally responsive and pedagogically sound instructional practices for youth in urban schools and communities; (6) meaningful and demonstrable professional development, anchored to real gains in young people's academic proficiency, personal development, and scholastic achievement in urban schools and communities.

Our recommendation for moving toward an equity-minded PDS is to expand the improvement of a teaching agenda to prepare teachers who know how to operate within the context of a community development agenda. Regardless of how well prepared teachers are, or how excellent the curriculum, children still cannot learn when they come to school hungry, angry, afraid, disaffected, unwell, or conflicted. The total contexts in which children grow, learn, and develop are necessary considerations in promoting their academic achievement and personal development.

We would further recommend paying critical attention to the life and culture of the school community. In the past, the "lab school" concept prevailed, where the role of the university partner was to provide both personnel and material resources that made these schools exceptional places for innovation, but limited in their applicability to wider agendas of reform and renewal. As both Hargreaves (1995) and Sarason (1993) explain, this type of PDS could at best illustrate how to create a new school, but not how to reform and renew an existing one.

A "Relationships Over Bureaucracies" Perspective

A sixth feature we would expect to find in an equity-minded PDS is a patently anti-bureaucratic mode of interaction among partners that permits flexibility of collaboration which involves all stakeholders in the enterprise of educating and developing children. This flexible collaboration is required in order to invite the participation of parents, community members, and all stakeholders necessary for effective problem definition and resolution.

A "Diversifying Multiple Roles" Perspective

As stated earlier, a public, community-centered and child-focused approach to building partnerships is essential to the project of developing an equity-minded professional relationship. Otherwise, perspectives that need to be surfaced, confronted, and negotiated will remain unvoiced. But within this partnership-building, there are opportunities for individuals to assume roles of leadership, training, support, and policymaking that are broader than the ascribed roles of "parent" or "teacher" or "administrator."

A "Community as Network of Relationships" Perspective

The eighth point of the transition concerns what really cements the partnership between school personnel and non-school personnel—building community through our actual physical presence in the schools. The participants in partner schools are adamant and clear about this being the essential ingredient for the cement of the partnership—that university and other non-school personnel spend time in the schools and in settings with children—Murrell's (1991) notion of "being there." We believe that the measure of our success as agents for change is not the expertise we bring as university people, but rather our capacity to learn in the company of others.

The vision of community building in this project is thought of in two ways. One is attending to how we work collaboratively with the community in truly democratic fashion. The other is how we build relationships within the professional development collaborative. Our belief, founded in experience, is that all participants bring assets and abilities, which, when collaboratively developed and employed, create healthy communities. This vision engenders an active disbelief in deficits-based professional practice that targets "clients" as needy, pathological, and incompetent. This vision calls us to foster relational practices in our personal and professional interactions and in our invitations to those with whom we work.

A "Joint Responsibility and Accountability" Perspective

It is our contention that the sort-and-select, meritocracy system of education in the United States must continuously be critically interrogated to honestly engage issues of equity. How can you have a vision of what schools could and should be when you are busy replicating what they already are? This necessary critical interrogation is rare, and we believe, rarer still in the development of PDS relationships. Thanks to the work of writers like Bowles and Gintes, Paulo Freire, Pierre Bordieu, and Henry Giroux, more educators have come to understand, in the last two decades, that the American educational system was designed to produce winners and losers. The system that works so well for those with the appropriate "cultural capital" also works well in relegating poor children of color to the lower realms of a social order. This understanding has been slow to take hold in discussions of educational equity in America because, as we have said, the dominance of concern with structure overtakes our concern with purpose. Reviews of the PDS literature, for example, reveal no such critical interrogation of the sort-and-select, meritocracy system of education—a critique that is essential to building an equity agenda.

Part of the reason for this is that the current reform movements—standards and national teacher assessment—are fabrics cut from the same cloth of the American educational system that has "losers" by design. The meritocracy ideology of the U.S. system of education is designed to differentiate children. In the first case, the agenda of "bringing kids up to standard" in the current system—with its "banking" epistemology (cf. Freire) and its sort-and-select axiology is both ethically and procedurally bankrupt with respect to equity, because it is a system predicated on the existence of "winners" defined in contradistinction to "losers." In the latter case of teacher assessment, preliminary results of the new teacher assessments reveal the same pattern of bias against black, Hispanic, and other candidates of color, as did the earlier National Teaching Exam (NTE).

CONCLUSION

Educational inequality has an embedded history in the United States. Reversing those patterns is never a simple matter of putting structures into place or framing goals and agendas. There is a real sense among those of us who are members of historically underserved cultural communities to "beware the remedies." W.E.B. DuBois' admonition[1] to African Americans regarding integrated schooling is as cogent today as it was 50 years ago—people should not be so anxious for a seat on the train that they do not question where the train is going. In this essay we have endeavored to provide a new framework for more effective engagement of equity issues in PDS work.

---

[1] Many thanks to the NCREST reviewer who reminded us of the admonition from W.E.B. DuBois in an extremely helpful review of an early draft of this manuscript.

We are not calling for the *abandonment* of the PDS idea, but for the *critically-informed expansion of* the idea. We have enumerated and described nine points of this expansion toward an equity-minded PDS collaborative. Each requires a critical shift in perspective. One aspect of this new perspective is fueled by systemic questioning of the PDS movement in the political, historical, and cultural contexts of American education. The other aspect of the perspective is an openness to the richness of alternative approaches to collaboration, community development, and to critical work on educational equality.

The inherent limitations of the PDS model with respect to equity will persist only to the extent to which its advocates remain closed to community-building approaches to partnership, service-learning approaches to creating participatory roles, and approaches that target real goals of community constituencies to improve the development and achievement of its children. We hope we are making those first steps toward a new beginning.

Table 1

Summary of Contrasts between the Traditional PDS with a New Notion of the Professional Development Community-Collaborative (PDCC)

Professional Development School Model	Perspectives of an Equity-Minded Partnership Framework
1. Equality of Schooling Educational equity viewed in terms of comparison of the "haves" and the "have nots."	**1. Quality of Education Perspective** Educational equity viewed in terms of determining first what constitutes quality education, and then determining where it must be developed.
2. Standard Bilateral Structure The institutional relationship is exclusively bilateral—a college or university partnering with a school or school district.	**2. Collaborative, Multilateral Partnerships** The institutional relationship is not exclusive to a single university or to a single school in partnership, but a multilateral, multipartnered collaborative including a diversity of institutional stakeholders, e.g., the schools in a "cluster" along with all the youth-oriented and community-based organizations in those neighborhoods.
3. Development of Teachers Focus is on the professional development of teachers and improving teaching as the foundation of restructuring of public education.	**3. Development of Communities** Focus is on the development of teachers, parents, schools, neighborhoods, and, most important, children as the foundation of restructuring and renewing public education.
4. Teacher-Focused Agenda The dynamic of the partnership is a kind of *quid pro quo* mutuality in the exchange of services and resources—teaching and clinical placements for the university, resources and training for the school.	**4. Expanded Teacher Preparation and Development Perspective** The dynamic of the partnership is community development—the mobilization of available resources within the "cluster" and eliciting community capacity for solving problems and managing dilemmas.

Table 1 (continued)
Summary of Contrasts between the Traditional PDS with a New Notion of the Professional Development Community-Collaborative (PDCC)

Professional Development School Model	Perspectives of an Equity-Minded Partnership Framework
5. Teacher as Pedagogue Teacher preparation more in the tradition of the "lab school" model that is top-down in design with little community- or school-based input.	**5. Scholar-Teacher** Teacher preparation focused on a new and different kind of teacher who recognizes, understands, and effectively negotiates complexities of urban communities that affect children's learning and development.
6. Bureaucratic Orientation Contractual arrangements and/or formal agreements are the cement of the working relationship.	**6. Relationships Over Bureaucracies** Community organization and community building are the cement of working relationships.
7. Delimited Unitary Roles Professionally circumscribed roles for participants—parents participating as parents, practitioners as practitioners, professors as professors.	**7. Diversifying Multiple Roles** Multiple roles for participants,—e.g., parents as trainers of teachers, parents as planners and policymakers.
8. Community as Geographic Area Tendency to define "community" according to geographic area—the actual boundaries of an area of the city.	**8. Community as Network of Relationships Bound by Common Interest and Commitment** Tendency to define "community" in terms of relationship bonds among those individuals having the same goals, purposes, and commitments with respect to children and families in a geographic area.
9. School Accountability Program evaluation focus is based on congruence to the model, not performance—increasingly based on how well the partnership conforms to the standards of the PDS model.	**9. Joint Accountability for Student Success** Program evaluation of the success of the collaborative partnership with respect to measurable and demonstrable improvements in children's academic achievement, personal development, and well-being.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). Reproduction in education, society, and culture. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Bowles, S., & Gintes, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. The report of the task force on teaching as a profession. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 341-344.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992, July). Standards of practice for learner-centered schools. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

Darling-Hammond, L., Lieberman, A., McLaughlin, M., & Miller, L. (1992). Professional development and reconstructing. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1903, 1989). The souls of Black folk. New York: Bantam Books.

Foster, M. (1992). Urban African American teachers' views of organizational change: Speculations on the experiences of exemplary teachers. Paper prepared for the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, The Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. OERI Grant No R117Q00005-92.

Freire, P. (1970, 1993). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. Educational Researcher, 21 (4), 4-11.

Goodlad, J. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In Sirotnik, K., and Goodlad, J. (Eds.), School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns, 3-31. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Teachers for our nations schools. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Goodlad, J. (1994). Education renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). Toward a social geography of teacher education. In N. K. Shimahara and I. Z. Holowinsky (Eds.), Teacher education in industrialized nations: Issues in changing social contexts. Chapter 5, pp. 3 - 40), New York: Garland Publishing.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge Press.

Irvine, J. J. (n.d.) Creating and sustaining diverse communities: The challenge of The Holmes Group. An evaluation of the Holmes equity agenda. Unpublished manuscript. Emory University.

Larabee: D.F., & Pallas, A.M. (1996). Dire straits: The narrow vision of The Holmes Group. Educational Researcher, 25 (4), 25-28.

Levine, M. (1996). Professional development school standards. Synthesis paper. A work in progress. Unpublished manuscript. National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Professional Development School Standards Project, Washington, DC.

Levine, M. (Ed.). (1992). Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Teacher development in professional practice schools. Teachers College Record, 92 (1), 105-112.

Little, J. W. (1994). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. In R. H. Anson (Ed.), Systematic reform: Perspectives on personalizing education. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Murrell, P. C. (1991). Cultural politics in teacher education: What's missing in the preparation of African-American teachers? In M. Foster (Ed.), Readings on Equal Education, 11, 205–225.

Murrell, P. C. (1994, Fall). In search of responsive teaching for African American males: An investigation of students' experience of middle school mathematics curriculum. Journal of Negro Education, 63 (4).

Murrell, P. C. (1997). Digging again the family wells: A Freirian literacy framework as emancipatory pedagogy for African American children. In P. Freire, J. Fraser, D. Macedo, T. McKinnon, & W. Stokes(Eds.), Mentoring the mentor: A critical dialog with Paulo Freire. New York: SUNY Press.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future. Report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. New York: Author.

Sarason, S. (1993). The case for change: Rethinking the preparation of teacher educators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. (1996). Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change." New York: Teachers College Press.

Shujaa, M. J. (1994). Education and schooling: Can you have one without the other? In M.J. Shujaa (Ed.), Too much schooling, too little education: A paradox in black life in white societies. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

Sykes, G. (1997). Worthy of the name: Standards for the professional development school. In M. Levine and R. Trachtman (Eds.), Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice and policy. New York: Teachers College Press.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development school standards project. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Manuscript prepared with support of the AT&T Foundation.

Valli, L,. Cooper, D., & Frankes, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), Review of research in education, 22, 251-304. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Woodson, C. G. (1933, 1990). The miseducation of the Negro. Washington, DC: Africa World Press.

Setting Standards for Professional Development Schools

Jon Snyder, Betty Lou Whitford, and Robert O. Williams

INTRODUCTION

This paper addresses three sets of issues arising from efforts to develop standards for professional development schools (PDSs). The first section discusses issues relating to the general question of why establish standards for PDSs at all. The second section addresses issues that arose when three different PDS communities participated in a structured process designed to elicit multiple grounded perspectives on potential content of professional development school standards. The third section addresses different conceptual frames for setting PDS standards that arose from the data discussed in the second section. Although based initially on that data, the discussion takes the issues beyond it and enters into a consideration of the wider theoretical issues connected to setting standards for professional development schools.

WHY STANDARDS?

The setting of standards for every educational institution and discipline area has become a national pastime as well as big business. When attention flags, CEOs of the largest multinational corporations compete with politicians across the political spectrum to garner public recognition as the returner of standards to the schools. Political gain aside, the obvious reason is embedded in the notion that "If you don't know where you are going, most likely that is where you will end up." Despite their popularity, there is, with few exceptions (Kirst, 1994; Porter, 1993; Sykes, 1997), little evidence to indicate whether standards meet their aim or, if they do, precisely how. On the other hand, there is a strong subterranean current of concern regarding standards as the route to educational nirvana. A recent American Educational Research Association symposium summarizing the work of a team of researchers with the National Academy of Education (1996) offered four fears:

- Standards divert attention from more fundamental needs;
- Standards undermine professional and local responsibility;
- Standards heighten inequality as long as resource allocation remains unequal (e.g., outcome standards without opportunity to learn standards);
- Standards historically have led to a trivialization of content and pedagogy (i.e., the minimalistic "basic skills" outcomes of the behavioral objectives' efforts, the de-meaning of teaching resulting from the rush to misapply some of the work of "Instructional Theory Into Practice").

There is a general human tendency to think standards are a good idea—for the other person. Therefore, it is not surprising that in hallways of higher education and coffee shops at conferences one hears toilers in the field of PDSs debating if standards for professional development schools are necessary or even desirable. The subtext one often senses is "What are they doing to us now?" The concerns, though authentic, may be moot, as the cat is already out of the bag. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), a major force shaping the structure and content of teacher education programs through its accreditation function, has developed standards for professional development schools (1997) and is piloting those draft standards to study their possible uses and abuses.

At a general level, the very notion of standards for professional development schools is an indication of their perceived value and significance in enhancing the education of students (Sykes, 1997). In addition, some fear that a lack of standards, and the framework they provide for guiding and empowering practice, may result in the loss of their potential contribution to American education (Levine & Wise, 1995). More specifically, Levine and Wise lay out several possible potentials for professional development school standards: (a) providing a lever for educational reform; (b) constructing a framework for professional accountability; and (c) enhancing the development of learner- and learning-centered schools and classrooms. Kirst (1994) offers a more negative, if equally persuasive reason, when he argues that the entire standards setting movement "culminates a 30-year loss of confidence in the capacity and judgment of local education agencies" (p. 383). When state legislatures (e.g., Texas) mandate a reduction of the number of teacher education courses a prospective teacher may take and other states (e.g., California) abolish the education major as a college discipline, good cause exists to recognize that confidence in the teacher education trade is indeed at a low ebb.

If these are compelling reasons to establish standards for professional development schools, and since standards are here whether the reasons are compelling or not, the debate turns to what kinds of standards, for what purposes, as determined by whom using what kinds of processes. The work described in this paper provides several perspectives on possible standards for professional development schools as well as several conceptual frame issues to consider in the development and use of such standards. It, like the vast majority of "research" on standards, is intended as a think piece.

MULTIPLE GROUNDED PERSPECTIVES ON CONTENT

Three school-university partnerships agreed to complete the following process and share the written results. The partnerships base their work in Louisville, Kentucky; Terre Haute, Indiana; and Santa Barbara, California. Each partnership first identified three different perspectives on the work of professional development schools. While not setting explicit criteria for "different perspectives," we provided several examples such as college-based administrator; school-based administrator; college-based teacher educator (elementary or secondary); college-based researcher; school-based teacher educator (elementary or secondary); prospective educator, etc. The participating partnerships then identified a "representative" from four different perspectives to engage in the following activity. Each representative responded to the following two prompts individually and in writing:

- What are the essential elements/components of a professional developmental school? For the purpose of this task, a PDS was defined as a relationship between, at least, a university and a school site where the two or more institutions agree to assume and share the responsibility for educating children, educating teachers, and constructing knowledge through sustained inquiry.
- For each, provide a description or an indicator of what that could look like in practice.

The second phase of the process involved bringing each partnership group together and sharing the responses participants had completed on their own. In two of the three sites, individuals wrote their responses immediately prior to the group discussion and then typed them up after the group discussion. In the Indiana site, individuals wrote their responses in advance and distributed them at the group meeting. Then the group was charged with coming to consensus on a common set of essential elements-components (standards) of a PDS. In addition, the groups were asked to identify areas where the individuals could not agree as well as tensions generated by both their individual and group efforts to generate standards and indicators. In two of the three sites, the groups completed the second task in one sitting. In Indiana, reaching a group consensus required two meetings.

We selected the three sites using a combination of logistical and conceptual criteria. The initial pool of possible participants came from involvement with the National Center for the Restructuring of Education, Schools, and Teaching's (NCREST) National Professional Development School Network. A subset of individuals within that group self-selected into a PDS policy subcommittee, which, over time, constructed the process outlined above as both a research and an educative strategy.

From the institutions represented on the policy subcommittee, we selected sites that balanced elementary and secondary teacher preparation as well as different geographical regions, community contexts, entry points and developmental levels of PDS work, and finance and governance structures.

The University of Louisville and surrounding schools and school districts have been engaged in significant partnerships since the mid 1980s. Their efforts are considered among the more mature professional development schools in the country. Aside from maturity and the research generated (e.g., Whitford, 1994), the Louisville partnership also stands out as spawning one of the few well-known secondary teacher education programs using a professional development school model. Six individuals were engaged in the task; four routinely work at Fairdale High School, and two have experience at other Louisville PDS sites. Four had their core salaries paid by the university, one by the school district, and one was a university master's student taking a co-taught course located at the high school site.

Indiana State University began its PDS work in 1991-92 when it formed a partnership with 10 schools (five elementary, one middle, and four high schools) in four school districts in west central Indiana. In 1994-95, they began work with the Indianapolis Public Schools; this has resulted in five additional schools joining the partnership (two elementary, one middle, and two high schools). The Indiana partnership, with significant institutional support from its inception, has quietly advanced to the forefront of professional development school initiatives as indicated by its selection as one of three finalists in the Association of Teacher Educators Distinguished Program in Teacher Education Award for 1996. Four individuals engaged in the task, each of whom drew their core salaries from the university. Their differing perspectives arose from their varied focus areas within education. One's field is special education, one's is mathematics education, a third's focus is portfolio assessment, and the fourth's field is curriculum theory. Despite their differing academic foci, each actively engages in professional development work as liaisons to PDS sites and/or researching with and teaching in professional development schools.

The University of California at Santa Barbara/Peabody Charter School partnership began in 1993. The Peabody Charter School is one of three elementary schools developing, with the university, into a professional development school site. Like the other two, the UCSB/Peabody partnership is a member of the NCREST's National Professional Development School Network, and their work together has been recently recognized for exceptional work in preparing teachers to work with second language learning immigrant children (Gonzalez and Darling-Hammond, 1997). Four participants engaged in the task: an elementary school teacher who teaches and supervises student teachers as well as serves as a cooperating teacher; a university paid, site-based supervisor of student teachers; an elementary school principal; and the college-based administrator of the teacher education program.

The Assignments

The following discussion addresses the issues that arose from both the process and the textual products of the activity. (The actual texts generated from the activity are included as Appendix A, see page 105.) The three participating sites produced different responses. The

Indiana group followed the process basically as designed. The Louisville group, with some members entering the process harboring doubts concerning the value of standards, focused its group discussion primarily on issues and tensions arising from the development and use of standards. The Santa Barbara group, after discussion, refused to complete the task feeling that coming to a common language was not as valuable as exploring the differences between their languages. (This made one of their members uncomfortable because he was the one who proposed the process in the first place.)

Summary of "Results"

In the interest of meshing with ongoing work in the field, the first analysis we used was to "map" both individual- and group-generated standards onto the components of a PDS generated by initial work conducted by the NCATE Standards Project. The NCATE work, through interviews and surveys, identified seven core components of PDS work including: (1) simultaneous renewal, (2) preservice teacher education, (3) inservice professional development, (4) inquiry, (5) learner-centered teaching and learning, (6) partnership parity, and (7) equity.

We assigned each standard generated by the activity (both individual-generated and group-generated standards) to one of the NCATE identified components. For instance, we categorized the standard from the activity, "A professional development school should model exemplary teaching," as mapping onto NCATE's "learner centered teaching and learning" component. This analysis used no small degree of judgment because it was possible to place certain standards in more than one area of agreement. For instance, does the following statement "fit" *partnership parity* or *preservice teacher education?* "The faculty within PDS sites feel an equal stewardship for those who are preparing to enter the profession with those at the university in teacher education programs." In these instances we made a judgment. In the above example, we decided the explicit emphasis was on preservice teacher education rather than partnership parity even though clearly "equal stewardship" implicitly raises partnership parity issues. In instances where standards contained explicit reference to more than one NCATE component, we placed them in both areas. For instance, we categorized the following statement as both *preservice teacher education* and *inservice professional development*: "A PDS partnership promotes and sustains opportunities for continued growth and development of all professional educators (preservice, induction, and continued professional development) in the partnership." Therefore, the number of standards indicated within the chart is greater than the number of standards generated by the assignment.

For a final validity check on our categorization, one member from each of the three groups checked our analysis. This group representative checked both for agreement with our placement of standards as well as clarifying our reading of the content of the standard.

For instance, the Louisville representative rephrased a standard so it more clearly met the group's intent to include inquiry as a standard.

The following table summarizes the analysis; the numbers in the grid constitute the number of times an area was mentioned.

NCATE Core Components	Indiana Individual	Indiana Group	Louisville Individual	Louisville Group	* Santa Barbara Individual
Simultaneous Renewal	4	2	5	2	4
Preservice Teacher Education	4	1	7	1	6
Inservice Professional Development	3	1	4	1	5
Inquiry	6	3	4	1	5
Learner Centered Teaching and Learning	6	2	5	2	4
Partnership Parity	5	1	9	1	6
Equity	2	1	2	1	2
Other	0	0	4	2	0

* group decided not to come to consensus.

The standards generated by PDS practitioners support the validity of the areas of agreement outlined by the NCATE process in that what these PDS participants mentioned as "essential elements or components of a PDS" can be interpreted as matching the findings of the NCATE project. The greater numbers generated by the individuals than by the group is to be expected because there were more "standards" generated. In the following section we discuss generated standards that did not map onto areas of agreement and the issues they raise for PDS standards setters.

Discussion of Results

Several issues surfaced from the mapping analysis. The first was what to do with standards generated that did not map onto the areas of agreement. The caliber of the generators' professional development work suggests that their "off the map" standards have some relationship with successful school-university partnerships and thus, require consideration. The Louisville contingent (as individuals and in consensus) provided several examples of interesting ideas for standards that did not fit the mapping analysis.

1. "University faculty able to guide university student perceptions so that a school is not punished for allowing access [to teacher education programs]." *School-based educator and group consensus*

2. "Challenge and inspire those who participate to stay optimistic that the future is bright and that education can work." *College-based educator*
3. "Lead and help provide fabric for surrounding community in all appropriate areas." *Preservice student*
4. "People involved in PDS work have to really want to change." *Group consensus*

The first two standards raise the question of who is accountable for meeting the standards. The first clearly states a responsibility of university faculty. Yet, a university is not, and by itself cannot be, a professional development school. More broadly, is any single PDS collaborating institution, whether a school or a university, solely responsible? If the first standard, for instance, is construed as protection for risk-taking at a school site, why is that any more a university responsibility than a school responsibility? The lesson may be that PDS standards need to be framed in such a way as to increase the understanding, and possibility, of shared accountability for the initial and ongoing education of professional educators (at schools and at universities) as well as the education of students (at schools and at universities). The Louisville group, in its own work, actually use a guiding principle that exemplifies such a framing: PDS participants assume a joint responsibility to "do no harm." Framed this way, the responsibility cuts both ways—university-based participants have a responsibility not to push school-based participants onto a risky limb and leave them there—and vice versa.

The third standard raises issues regarding the nature of the relationship between professional educators and the "community." The standard argues that educators link with other community agencies to establish interconnecting support systems for children and families. The fact that it was only raised by a "pre-professional" begs the larger issue of whether the well-intentioned commitment of professional development schools to "professionalize" teaching may be building walls between home and school and the community and school that may not be in the best interest of children and their families—the "clients" for the profession of teaching. Notable here is that the NCATE areas of agreement, which do not include an explicit "community" function, came from a wide and inclusive survey and discussion among professional educators.

The fourth standard raises the issue of individual versus institutional responsibility. In other words, is "really wanting to change" a pre-existing individual disposition that an institution might assess in its hiring practices, or is it something (e.g., a commitment to continuous improvement) that a set of collaborating institutions instills and develops in its students and faculty? While context can play a role in maintaining dispositions, can a context create a disposition? It is a bit like the old joke, "How many psychologists does it take to change a light bulb? Only one, but the light bulb has to really want to change."

Another issue regarded the way participants, who are all actively engaged in building and sustaining professional development schools, defined partnership in terms of activities and attitudes rather than in terms of partnership constitutions or specific governance structures. For instance, participants used terms such as "open communication," "trust," "non-hierarchical," "co-constructed perspectives" and never in such a way as to indicate the need for agreed-upon formal structures established prior to or early in the relationship. Growers of professional development school relationships followed the approach that Miller and Silvernail (1994) call "systematic adhocism." This stands in stark contrast to the more structuralist view found in most institutional standards, and expressed by Sykes (1997) who argues that the earliest stage of PDS development is a foundation of governance agreements. The different understanding of PDS work expressed through the process outlined in this paper is an important issue for standards-setters to consider as it suggests that outcome indicators cannot be structurally imposed in advance of the actual work of building and sustaining conversations and relationships that support the achievement of those outcome indicators. The issue may be how to co-evolve explicit policies (contracts, governance agreements, covenants, etc.) and human relationships. Sites that put the explicit policies in place without thinking about and providing time for the "extra-rational" components of human relationships and learning the work may never get off the ground. On the other hand, placing sole emphasis on the human and the relational components of education often results in efforts not surviving personnel changes or, worse, never getting off the ground because "flexibility" masked power and status relationships that destroyed the potential of the human relationships. How can standards be written, and interpreted, so that the necessary symbiosis of human relationships and structural "rules" is established (if not already present) and sustained (if already happening)?

The importance given across the board to inquiry offers several puzzlements. A cursory look suggests that "inquiry" related standards received even greater recognition from school-based educators than from college-based educators. This emphasis on inquiry from the school-based educators contrasts with the often expressed notion that school-based educators neither value nor use research. Since this finding suggests school-based educators (at least those involved in professional development school work) do value and wish to use research, the issue may be the nature, content, and presentation of research. A second bewilderment from this finding is why, if so valued, the lack of evidence of research emanating from professional development schools (Berry, et al., 1996; Teitel, 1996). Does this again have something to do with definitions of research? Of inquiry? Of a lack of space for the type of inquiry/research a PDS is capable of spawning? Of something being important because it is lacking?

The Santa Barbara Rebellion

Before moving into a discussion of different conceptual frames for standards-setting arising from this activity, Santa Barbara's refusal to come to consensus requires recognition. In their consensus statement not to come to consensus, they explained that they initially felt the different perspectives represented in their individual responses were all saying the same thing using a different language. As the discussion progressed, they came to believe the different perspectives were not "just saying the same thing in different language" but rather that the different languages used allowed them to access complementary concepts. As a result, the group began to think of its work together as learning a second language. They wrote:

> The more we tried to find a common language, the more we began to understand the values of our separate languages and thus of being bilingual. Therefore, we consciously decided not to come to a common language for the following reasons:
>
> - Each language, as a marker and maker of cultural meaning, is capable of particular elegance and nuances that the other languages are not—coming up with one language loses some of those nuances that we believe provide the essential power of a professional development school;
> - Choosing one language (even a hybrid language) inevitably privileges one language over another, which is antithetical to the values we share regarding a professional development school; and
> - One of the goals for our work together is to provide ourselves (school- and college-based educators) and our students (schoolchildren and prospective teachers) with multiple languages with which to enrich our work and our understanding of that work and our lives.

In summary, the process of collaboratively making visible our values and how we express them (e.g., setting standards) was a productive educational experience. It enriched our knowledge and ability to use a second (and sometimes a third) language as well as our understanding and use of our "home" language. At least for ourselves in this small setting, we are not certain that crafting a single language to express those values is as worthwhile an endeavor as using multiple languages to understand our inevitable and essential differences and in so doing, enrich our understandings of, and our ability to enact, our common values.

Conceptual Frames for PDS Standards

We frame the following discussion of some of the broader issues related to setting standards for professional development schools with the questions presented in the first section of this paper. If PDS standards are coming, then those involved in the work should offer their perspectives on the issues surrounding what kinds of standards, for what purposes, as determined by whom using what kinds of processes.

WHAT KINDS OF STANDARDS?

It is possible to classify standards into three types. The first is minimum-performance (input or output) standards. The core function of minimum-performance standards is for public assurance (e.g., to counteract the lack of confidence of the public). An example of a minimum performance standard for a PDS might read: "A professional development school must establish a governance team of equal membership of school- and college-based teachers and administrators who meet monthly. No personnel, budget, or curricular issue may be introduced without approval of this governance team." The standard is hard-edged, comprehensible, and measurable. As such, it can also "be met." With this type of standard, a PDS is something that can be achieved.

A second type of standard is a statement of values. The purpose of a values standard is to keep one's eyes on the prize. An example of a values standard, in content aligned with the example of the minimum performance standard, is: "A professional development school establishes trust and respect in a partnership of parity." In order for this type of standard to be comprehensible and measurable, a PDS would need to define what these abstract value statements mean in their context and determine feedback mechanisms that would allow the group to assess their progress toward enacting the value. A values standard can never be met and, thus, a PDS is not something to be achieved but a direction towards which to focus one's actions and aspirations.

A third type of standard is a structures-and-processes standard. Its purpose is to establish conditions that enhance the possibilities of desired outcomes (as opposed to the minimum competency standard that concretely mandates the outcome or the values standard that lays out the values that guide the construction of the outcome). An example of a structures-and-processes standard is: "A professional development school offers release time with recognized rewards for college faculty to spend on school site, and districts provide staff development funds to support the additional responsibilities of school-based educators in teacher education." A structures-and-processes standard can be measured and met but is not the desired outcome of the endeavor. It is not an end in itself. Thus, this standard resides somewhere in between a PDS as something that can be achieved and a PDS as a direction toward which to focus.

Each of the three types of standards has its own strengths and weaknesses. Each helps, in different degrees, the different purposes of a PDS. Each constrains, in different degrees, the different purposes of a PDS. Thus, any determination of the type, or balance between types, of standards requires consideration of their purpose.

FOR WHAT PURPOSES?

The simplistic, but still ultimately solely defensible purpose for standards for professional development schools is to benefit children and their families. The NCATE areas of agreement are implicit belief statements of what will enhance that single outcome. The Louisville group raised the issue directly by asking, "Are there any examples in the history of education where standards have actually changed the quality of the work and the benefit to students?" If not, the Louisville group would seem to suggest, if standards are to meet their potential benefits they had better be different from previously existing standards. Of course, it is possible that a variety of capacity issues have hindered our ability to answer the question. For instance, has any educational system ever had the capacity to actually implement standards-driven reform on a large enough scale to answer the question whether it was the standards or the work of a few educators within a supportive environment that "made the difference?" Do we possess the technical capacity to measure the effects of the multitude of relationships between standards and outcomes for students, for any standards, let alone standards for a reform as sweepingly indirect as professional development schools?

Standards, again ultimately, are an accountability mechanism. The first question is accountability for whom? Students (whether K-12 or prospective teachers)? Schools? Colleges? Both? If both, combined or separate? Teachers? As noted earlier, the multitude of players, stakeholders, and institutions with a hand in the education of teachers, not to mention the multitude of indirect linkages among all the responsible parties, make "who is accountable" a very confusing question in the current system.

Accountability is a set of related policies to enhance the probabilities of responsible and responsive practice (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 1992). As such, two overarching issues arise regarding the best way to frame a set of policies to improve educational outcomes for children. The first is the balance required between the need to gain consensus and the need to promote change (Ball, 1992). Gaining consensus requires gaining broad appeal, and broad appeal tends to be a conserving influence. Thus, a position on the consensus side of the continuum tends to codify "what is." The need to promote change requires that standards must do more than reflect current practice. They must "push the envelope" and create new assumptions and new practices. The harder the push for change, however, the harder is the resistant push. In addition, getting too far out in front is not necessarily the best large-scale change strategy. The goal of consensus standards is incremental change; the goal of "push the envelope" standards is radical systemic change.

The balancing act between a conserving consensus and radical change relates to the type of standards one might use. Minimum competency standards tend to fall on the gaining consensus end of the continuum. As such, rather than create and support new practices, they codify what is, hoping for incremental change. Vision standards push the envelope and hope for more radical changes. Structures-and-processes standards, again, fall in the middle—gaining some consensus but hoping the incremental changes lead to the implicit assumptions about where the incremental changes of structures and processes will ultimately lead.

The second major accountability issue is whether the purpose of standards is to *control* those doing the work or to *support* those doing the work (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 1991; Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 1992). The Santa Barbara group took a stance on this issue by refusing to come to a group consensus. Underlying the group's rationale was the idea that the purpose of standards is educational and supportive of their work rather than criteria (even if set internally) to control their work. For all of the individual and each of the group responses, the purpose of standards was to support, not to attempt to control.

Underlying the notion of support is development. Development means growth over time in a particular direction. Thus, values standards would be a better fit for supportive accountability. The often-heard phrases that learning to teach is developmental and that professional development schools are developmental in nature suggest agreement that standards should be developmental in nature. Yet, just what is a developmental standard? Are they Piagetian stages (or Kohlberg or Erickson or Vygotsky)? Are they like merit badges one progresses through? If so, then minimum-competency standards could be developmental. A PDS meets these initial competencies, and they are tenderfoots and so forth and so on until a PDS is an Eagle Site. Even the phrase itself can tend to approach the meaningless. As far as the authors are concerned, everything that involves individuals and groups working together is developmental. Everything is developmental; so what? What does it mean to acknowledge reality in standards?

Still, the recognition of reality may be no small step in the improvement of accountability policies. Are, however, "developmental standards" possible? First, if standards are in some way outcome indicators (even if those outcomes are processes—structures-and-processes standards; or those outcomes are defined by the sites as they enact values—values standards) how does the notion of development fit in? It seems as if embedded in the notion of "developmental" is the reality that professional development schools are multidimensional, complex social relationships. Yet standards, even if not used in a control/compliance mode, are constrained (if not actually linear) by the nature of the written word. Novels may approach a description of multidimensional, complex social relationships, but no one has yet written standards in the form of a novel.

Second, if standards are descriptions of indicative activities, history suggests the danger of implementing activities without meeting the underlying conceptual spirit of those activities (Cohen, 1991). On the other hand, standards as conceptual values may not meet the needs of toilers in the field seeking indicative activities to help make their own practices visible. The core nut, it seems, may be that conceptual values (e.g., values standards) and activities (e.g., minimum-performance and structures-and-processes standards) must co-evolve in the doing of the work. Confounding logic, it may be that neither starting place works. It may be that what "makes" a PDS is the tension created when using both conceptual values and activities simultaneously in the commitment to a public accounting of one's values and how they are being enacted.

Finally, if one of the purposes of standards is to garner the resources and support needed to do the work, will "developmental standards" work for this purpose? Is not a clearly defined "supportive" policy the provision of the necessary time and money? Policy development is a response to a problem. Historically, policymakers have not been keen on hearing that their responses will take a long time. Nor have policymakers been pleased when told they cannot construct the answers to the problem being addressed. For instance, one Indiana participant recommended having "toilers in the field try out" the standards inherent in work already developed by such organizations as The Holmes Partnership, NCREST, and National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). He then recommended following up the "try outs" with such questions as:

- Do the guides set out by these groups work? Which ones? Why?
- What changes in PDS operations have you made in order for the process to take hold?
- What new issues emerged as you moved to implement/sustain a PDS?

Although such a process would certainly delay the establishment of standards, he argues that without such a process we will be making the same mistakes as were made with the application of effective schools research. Good schools have a widely shared vision of what the school should be. Therefore, write a vision statement and you will have a good school. On the other hand, his process also sounds very much like values standards. Yet his critique of the use of the effective schools research suggests that agreeing on a vision does not necessarily amount to a hill of beans.

Metaphorically, policies are attempts to get to heaven, and the best we may be able to hope for is purgatory. Is policy purgatory a location to generate the will and the skill needed to realize the potentials of professional development schools? On the other hand, as any good spin doctor will tell you, over-promising has a way of casting successes as failures.

Research in the field (e.g., Snyder, et al., 1995) increasingly suggests that the essential elements in the education of teachers are "trust and respect, and conversations and relationships." Can there be a standard for respect? For relationships? What kind of standards will enhance the possibility of those outcomes? What form can they take, and how can they be used to make meeting them meet what we are really after?

Returning concretely to the data that set off this discussion, we summarize the responses of all three sites (individually and as groups) into three criteria to be used as a starting point for standards-setting for professional development schools. Standards must:

- Support the work (addressing the support-versus-control issue);
- Allow for variation in context (addressing the developmental issue);
- Encourage, not inhibit, creative responses (addressing the push-the-envelope versus gain-consensus issue).

Determined By Whom Using What Kinds of Processes?

At the core of the "who should determine PDS standards" is the "what is a PDS anyway?" Lythcott and Schwarz (1994) describe two ways of viewing a PDS: (1) as a school site and (2) as an evolving set of consensual values and concepts enacted in the relationships within, between, and across institutions and individuals. A school-site conception leads to either minimum-performance standards or structures-and-processes standards. An enacting-values-through-and-within relationships conception leads to values standards. An example of the conception of a PDS as a school site is the following individual Indiana response:

- A professional development school should model exemplary teaching;
- A professional development school should be filled with a spirit of inquiry;
- A professional development school should have faculty, administration, and staff committed to professional improvement through graduate education and through inservice and conference participation;
- A professional development school should be highly involved in preservice teacher education;
- A professional development school should provide a learning environment that supports all students and learning styles;
- A professional development school should model collaboration and teamwork;
- A professional development school should have close associations and exchanges with its university partner.

Given such a notion of a PDS as a school site, who should be developing standards for a PDS? One could certainly question whether an organization consisting of colleges of teacher education with the function of accrediting such colleges is an appropriate group to be setting school-site standards.

The notion of a PDS as enacting values within and through relationships is exemplified in the Indiana group response that tended to cite an indicator of each standard in both a school and a university location. For instance, one of that group's standards was "restructured roles of PDS participants." The group's indicators were, "incorporate time during the instructional day for altered roles in decision making and planning" (an indicator located within a school) and "changed expectations of the professoriate to be more reflective of roles expected in PDS work" (an indicator located within a university).

Thus, the "value" is the standard and that value is located in multiple sites. Here, it may seem more appropriate for an organization such as NCATE to help develop standards as long as the process is inclusive of as many of the sites (meaning organizational settings) and as many of the ideas as is humanly possible. Kirst (1994) provides another argument for a loose federal federation such as NCATE (funded by a private foundation to conduct the work) to construct standards. He argues:

> The key concept of the 1990's education strategy, however, is "nationwide" policies, rather than "federal government" policies. Neither a large array of mandated federal policies nor a great increase in federal aid … is expected. …Examples of nationwide policy exist today. These include the Scholastic Aptitude Test, American College Testing program, school accreditation, the College Board, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. … As in these prior efforts, nonprofit organizations and foundations will be the catalysts and funders (p. 384).

On the other hand, if a PDS is about enacting values within and through institutional and individual relationships, then in some ways, such a notion demands a new dimensional institution—neither school nor university. Once again, it is possible to support standards for PDSs and to support the role of accreditation in enhancing education in this country and still raise the question of who should be setting standards for work that may not "belong" in any institution. Thus, the question is raised not to bash "nationwide" PDS standard-setters such as NCATE or The Holmes Partnership, but rather as a friendly suggestion to any PDS standard-setting process to understand and address these concerns early and often in the process rather than wait until the end and be buried in an avalanche of antagonism. Still, there may be no escaping that avalanche. If the truth be told, while easy to favor standards for others, the mere mention of standards for their own work sends shivers down the spines of many educators. Those shivers may result less from whom and how standards are developed than from fears of their usage. If the use of standards historically has been to control (and then to blame) educators rather than to support educators and then to hold them responsible (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 1991), little wonder the shivers.

Santa Barbara's refusal to come to a common language regarding standards touches on both the issues: who should set standards, and how should they be set. Santa Barbara's decision, however, went beyond the issue of privileging one language over another and into the value of maintaining separate languages. The group's refusal to complete the task it had undertaken may constitute an important challenge to the rationale of standards—no matter who develops what kinds. One of the core assumptions of standards is that providing a common language enhances the construction of shared meaning. In this case, a group of people, passionately committed to and engaged in constructing the same goals as the setters of standards for professional development schools argues that the attempt to create a common language is a hindrance to those shared goals. While possibly politically naive, the metaphor of bilingualism raises interesting questions. Is there greater value in multiple-language proficiencies than in crafting a common language? Is it better for those working across institutions that use different languages to learn to speak each other's language or to develop one of their own? Is it possible to communicate without a common language? Even if bilingualism is an exemplary goal, is it an achievable one?

A FINAL WORD

As we started earlier, this paper is designed to be a "think piece." As such, it raises more questions than it answers. In that we feel confident of success. We also believe that consideration of the questions raised will enhance the probability that the standards being developed will make a difference in the lives of children, whose care families entrust to teachers and to the schools.

REFERENCES

American Educational Research Association. (1996, April 8). Improving education through standards-based reform. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York.

Ball, D. L. (1992). Implementing the NCTM standards. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Berry, B., Boles, K., Edens, K., Nissenholtz, A., & Trachtman, R. (1996). Inquiry and professional development schools: A working paper. Paper prepared for the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, New York.

Cohen, D. (1991, Fall). Revolution in one classroom, or, then again, was it? American Educator, 18-48.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, D. (1991). Curriculum studies and the traditions of inquiry: The scientific tradition. In P. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum, (pp. 41-78),Washington, DC: AERA.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (1992). Framing accountability: Creating learner-centered schools. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), The changing contexts of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gonzalez, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). New concepts for new challenges: Professional development for teachers of immigrant youth. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Kirst, M. (1994, August). The politics of nationalizing curricular content. American Journal of Education, 102, 383-393.

Levine, M., & Wise, A. (1995, fall). Professional development school standards. PDS Network News, 2, 1-7.

Lythcott, J., & Schwarz, F. (1994). Professional development in action: An idea with visiting rights. In L. Darling-Hammond, (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. (pp. 126-155). New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, L., & Silvernail, D. (1994). Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond, (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. (pp. 28-49). New York: Teachers College Press.

The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1997, October). Draft Standards for Identifying and Supporting Quality Professional Development Schools. Washington, D.C.: Author

Porter, A. (1993, July). School delivery standards. Education Researcher, 22, 24-30.

Snyder, J., Lippincott, A., & Bower, D. (1995, April). Portfolios in teacher education: Technical or transformation? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Sykes, G. (1997). Worthy of the name: Standards for the professional development school. In M. Levine, & R. Trachtman (Eds.), Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice and policy. (pp. 159-193). New York: Teachers College Press.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development schools: A literature review. Washington, DC: Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Whitford, B. L. (1994). Permission, persistence, and resistance: Linking high school restructuring with teacher education reform. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession (pp. 74-97). New York: Teachers College Press.

APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP RESPONSES TO TASK

- What are the essential elements/components of a professional developmental school? For the purpose of this task, a PDS was defined as a relationship between, at least, a university and a school site where the two or more institutions agree to assume and share the responsibility for educating children, educating teachers, and constructing knowledge through sustained inquiry.
- For each, provide a description or an indicator of what that could look like in practice.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Individual Responses

School-Based Educator; On-Site Coordinator of PDS Activities

- Open communication between PDS/University so that ideas, problems, and successes can be shared in an atmosphere of mutual trust. Willingness to confront issues.
- University faculty able to "guide" university student perceptions so that an open school is not punished for allowing access.
- Adequate faculty buy-in, willingness to develop new teachers. Mutual effort to make the university student's work real and meaningful so it is not an add-on for the teachers, but an extension of and support for the teachers' curriculum.
- Intellectual interplay. University faculty generally have more time and access to stay abreast of readings, so they need to share through staff development, conversations, etc., to raise the level of discourse.
- Understanding of and respect for school's vision and mission.
- University faculty must take disparate student entities and bond them quickly so that group goals and perceptions are helpful to and further the work of the school.
- School models involvement in a continuous improvement effort.
- Core school faculty should model professionalism.
- School should be receptive to information and perceptions of university students.

College-Based Educator; University Liaison for High School PDS; Member of High School School-Based Decision-Making (SBDM) Council

- Collaboration among school and university educators that is or aims to be democratic and collegial, honoring the perspectives each brings to the work.

  In practice. Decision-making processes routinely include both school and university representatives; e.g., schools include university representation on SBDM councils; universities include school representation on search committees. When a partner feels excluded, the differences are discussed. Involvement in mutual decision making should be routine rather than an event.

- There needs to be a commitment to reflection and continuous improvement, an accounting for what is happening, what effects it may have, and how it could be realistically improved—"it" is whatever concerns the collaboration.

  In practice. Discussion groups, action research teams, SBDM committees.

- A PDS should have high-quality teacher preparation as part of the mission but should not be exclusively focused on teacher preparation. Teacher preparation work in schools needs to connect—programmatically and seamlessly—with campus work. The collaboration also needs to connect with or extend to professional development of experienced educators (university and school) and faculty and students in other School of Education graduate programs.

College-Based Educator; Member of High School SBDM Council; Co-Instructor of Site-Based Pre-Student Teaching Course

I am not sure there is "one" essential component or "element" of a PDS, and I resist the development of standards. So I share the following with hesitation.

A PDS should:

- Focus on the well-being of all involved, particularly students;
- Challenge and inspire those who participate to stay optimistic that the future is bright and that education can work;
- Connect the best we know about teaching, learning, and structuring teaching and learning to the day-to-day realities of doing it;
- Motivate leadership of all types and levels to change the organizations, structures, and habits we bring to the table that get in the way both of helping kids and sustaining a positiveness about the profession.

We know that most folks will say PDS work is as diverse as the schools/universities/others who participate.

One indicator would be that those who participate say that 1-4 (above) are happening. Another would be that student learning improves, but if you figure out how to assess that one, let us know. The best indicator is that those who participate continue to want to work together, to increase the level of cooperation, and to feel deeply rewarded personally and professionally from the relationship.

The question I try to ask is: "Does PDS make a difference in the lives of students, teachers, administrators, parents, community, higher education?" If yes, then how do we know? If no, then move on. …

MA Teacher Candidate in Chemistry and Physics

Student learning. Comprehensive programs for all (groups of) students, ranging from special education through gifted/talented. Reaching out to special education, helping agencies through mentors, universities, others. An environment fostering student creativity, academic "risk taking." School staff to be role models and mentors to student body.
Teacher education. Self-teaching, peer teaching, external explorations (courses, meetings, seminars, sabbaticals); exchange programs with other schools; comprehensive cross-fertilization within faculty.

Communities. All three of the following communities need teamwork, collaboration, and leadership.

- Professional. Be a leader in education improvement/reform by piloting, setting examples, stimulating others at local, state, even national levels.
- Lay people. Lead and help provide fabric for surrounding community in all appropriate areas—activities, sports, academic excellence (all ages), open forums, service learning, solid relationship with parents.
- Business/government/other. Lead/foster symbiotic relationships with the above, including service learning, internships, visiting speakers.

College-Based Educator; Co-Instructor of Site-Based Pre-Student Teaching Course

I am going to share, in a stream-of-consciousness mode, and through the eyes and experiences of a newcomer to a PDS, some of what I have seen thus far since coming to the University of Louisville.

A reciprocal relationship between the university and (other institutions?) and the school is a must. This relationship takes numerous shapes and occurs in various forms. For me, it comes down to human beings and the value folks place on the nature and importance of PDS work. Both the school and university need to benefit. Teachers, student teachers, students, administrators, and university folk are involved in organization, planning, policy, assessment, etc.

Traditional hierarchical relationships disappear. The work of and in a PDS is ongoing and mutual; shared responsibility across and within various entities occurs. Teacher education changes from traditional concepts to a much broader, ongoing, and inclusive process (preservice through development of experienced teachers); inservice teachers take as active a role in teacher education as university-designated teacher education folks.

Practicum experiences become a contextualized part of a PDS rather than an overlay or underlay. Student teachers work on their professional development from the foundation/core of the real work happening in schools and learn about professional practice situated in a school—not in an assigned, isolated classroom.

Support systems, networking opportunities—frequent, formal, and informal—for ongoing improvement and development are present.
Other quick thoughts:
Rewards for PDS sites and for those working in them need to be considered. These may take various forms, but they are a crucial and necessary element.

- Relationships are unique; think about what these are;
- Leadership;
- Connections;
- Levels of professional practice are recognized (novice, master, etc.);
- Master's degree work at University of Louisville with the students in our program;
- New notions about teaching and learning—stretching boundaries, expanding concepts, definitions; and
- Role of parents.

College-Based Educator; Coordinator of PDS Work; University Liaison to Elementary PDS

Collaborative arrangement with an outside agency/institution. Collaborative arrangement with educational agency/higher education institution that is supportive of mutual goals/activities.

Commitment of all partners to the ultimate goal of excellence of education for students in the school.

Commitment of a core of faculty/staff at both institutions to using state-of-the-art practices and continued professional growth and development.

Preservice teacher education and administrator preparation programs jointly operated and assessed (and/or other mentoring function with professionals).

Jointly sponsored research and development projects.

Representation of partnering school/agency on advisory committees/boards.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Group Responses

Areas of Agreement (More or Less)

- PDS work is a collaboration among agencies, schools, universities—organizations and individuals.
- PDS work should focus on helping and nurturing the teaching-learning process for kids, making the work (and the working conditions) better for all involved. (Work cannot be add-ons to an already full agenda.)
- PDS work is a long-term, developmental journey that requires the commitment of a core of school and university faculty to nurturing and continually improving teaching and learning on the part of individuals. When this happens over time, good work drives out bad. (Good work becomes more the norm, and bad work is harder to hide.)
- PDS work is complex and difficult when it is focused on creating practices that accomplish success for all kids and success for all teachers. (Success involves being a lifelong learner.)
- PDS work requires a "can-do," positive attitude that education can get better. PDS work should challenge and inspire educators.
- People involved in PDS work have to really want to change.
- PDS work requires a willingness to put past rules on the table (e.g., workday and number of prep rules, attendance and tardy rules, FTE and contact-hour rules in universities, tenure and promotion rules).

Questions/Concerns/Areas of Disagreement

- How we are going about professionalizing teaching raises concerns about agendas being imposed on those involved in developing PDS work (e.g., teacher certification, teacher evaluation); need to protect equity and access.
- PDS work creates conditions that encourage others to thrust more work upon us because we are trying new approaches. Often we are not prepared to handle what is expected because of lack of resources (money, time, staff, expertise). One example cited was University of Louisville/school educators supervising first-year teachers from other institutions who were prepared differently.
- We need to better understand how to convince the public that schooling is more complicated than a place that can provide "drive-through success." How can we become educators of the community? How to share/take on responsibility for leadership at many levels (classroom, school, university-wide, state, national) when our plates are already overflowing?
- Is PDS truly a promising strategy for professionalizing teaching? Can teaching be

professionalized as long as the differences in what teachers do (including quality of work) are not recognized, not acknowledged, and not rewarded?

- How do we decide which decisions about PDS work must be made collaboratively? What goes on the table from each—university and school (and other invclved agencies) for mutual consideration?
- Since PDS work requires flexibility and emerging, developmental relationships that are very context-based, how can we capture these qualities in standards? Are "developmental standards" possible, or is this an oxymoron? Are there any examples in the history of education where standards have actually changed the quality of the work and the benefit to students?
- Standards that give us guidelines can be useful—something to compare our work with so that we can better understand what we like about it, despite the standard presented, and what we might want to change because of the standard. There is such a proliferation of standards about so many aspects of schooling. Can we even develop a matrix that captures the expectations, requirements, demands of each set? (e.g., child development standards; content standards; student performance standards; certification standards; accreditation standards for teacher education, schools, universities, etc.)

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AT TERRE HAUTE

Individual Responses

College-Based Educator; PDS Liaison to Two Sites

- Standard: That all PDS schools be places where the assumption is that all students can learn,—and, where every attempt is then made to help all students meet their full potential.

  Not to be confused with the common rhetoric in this vain—but rather the true belief that such is a truth, a "given," a possibility. While students represent a full range of potential, a site that actually believes and practices this standard would establish a climate in which students' accomplishments, large and small, would be recognized and celebrated. Teachers would incorporate all students into their plans and model the acceptance necessary for their potential to be reached.

- Standard: That PDS schools be climates which foster collaboration both among staff within the school itself and between the school and the university personnel.

  Healthy, fruitful environments are those where teachers genuinely support and encourage one another—a climate where the focus is upon student learning outcomes and all efforts are concentrated on that end. Teachers would solicit input from their peers, comfortable in the knowledge that the feedback will be offered in a constructive and mutually-supportive way.

PDS schools would also be places where university and public school faculties would work together without the traditional hierarchy, that is, classroom teachers looking to university personnel for the answers. These sites would, by contrast, be places where mutual respect and a sense of equality would exist, with university personnel looking to their classroom counterparts for input and guidance at least as often as the other way around.

- Standard: That the faculty within PDS sites feel an equal stewardship for those who are preparing to enter the profession with those at the university in teacher education programs.

Again, collaborative efforts would be necessary to "share the load," so to speak. Classroom teachers would be integral team players in redesigning teacher education programs, seen by their counterparts at the university as equally knowledgeable in what should and should not be necessary components of such programs.

Some of the direct instruction would also be delivered to those preservice teachers by classroom teachers themselves—even on site in those PDS schools when appropriate. University personnel would also work within the PDS site, delivering instruction to public school students as a way of modeling and maintaining credibility.

College-Based Educator; PDS Liaison; Instructor of Professional Development Course for PDS School-Based Faculty

For me, the essential elements or components of a PDS can be encapsulated in an acronym: DRIVE. Although the word itself has many definitions, two in particular convey my meaning: (1) "to carry vigorously through," and (2) "vigorous effort toward a goal." In addition to these surface meanings, each letter of DRIVE contains the following components related to PDS:

D Developmental approach that is *documented* by and used to inform participants (school and university) via systematic *dissemination* of findings/insights to improve efforts within and beyond the collaborative.

Indicators/evidence:
An implementation plan containing goals and phases or levels of increasing involvement and commitment by members of the PDS collaborative. This component would also entail longitudinal documentation by teams of school and university faculty that would regularly meet to explore emerging insights and issues to better inform their work. Insights gained would not only be shared within individual sites but also across other PDS sites as well as other schools and universities.

R Resources (i.e., time and people and/or time for people) that result in *restructured* roles, *responsibilities* and *reciprocity* of efforts for both school and university folks who engage in PDS work and who also engage in *regular* reflective/metacognitive analysis of their work to identify necessary improvements.

Indicators/evidence:
A "critical mass" of both school and university faculty at each site. Because PDS sites differ in size, a specified number is not possible. However, more than a handful is necessary, especially if the same folks are engaged in multiple initiatives. Furthermore, their workloads would include PDS-related efforts rather than PDS work being an add-on to an already full work schedule. This would be evidenced by things like time to meet during the day; time to read, write, reflect, plan, and inquire into work in progress.

I Initiative (rather than inertia) to strive for *implementation* of innovative practice, *integrated* efforts and *inquiry* (both individual and collaborative) into work in progress as well as data collection for future initiatives.

Indicators/evidence:
Action, enthusiasm, productivity and drive. School and university faculty would be jointly engaged in teaching for understanding for PDS students, preservice students, and themselves. In addition, all involved would regularly inquire into efforts and initiatives.

V Vision about teaching and learning in schools and teacher preparation that is co-constructed, co-delivered, and grounded in *virtue* (moral and ethical commitment) with attention to *vitality-maintenance* for long-term efforts.

Indicators/evidence:
A learning community. As a result of collaborative visioning and planning, school and university faculty would evince commitment and high ethical standards in their work with children, preservice students, and their colleagues. In addition, efforts would be made to maintain energy-levels, relationships, and other components necessary to work in these labor-intensive environments.

E Egalitarian approach to relationship-building and collaboration resulting in *empowerment* and *efficacy* and *enthusiasm* for labor-intensive yet important and gratifying work.

Indicators/evidence:
Efficacy. If attention has been paid to establishing equitable relationships toward common goals, then all stakeholders/participants would be empowered and thus enthusiastic for this difficult, yet important, work. This would be evinced by powerful commitment and dogged determination to do what it takes for the benefit of both PDS and preservice students.

College-Based Educator; Supervises Student Teachers in PDS Sites; Researcher of Math Instruction in PDS Site

A professional development school should model exemplary teaching.

- Teachers are enthusiastic about teaching.
- Teachers are knowledgeable about current trends in education.
- Teachers are willing to try new ideas in their classrooms.
- Teachers are reflective about their practice.
- Teachers consider pursuing national board certification.

A professional development school should be filled with a spirit of inquiry.

- School personnel seek out common "reform" issues.
- School personnel are not afraid to examine their school and their classrooms.
- School personnel engage in action research.
- Classrooms encourage students to question and investigate their world.

A professional development school should have faculty, administration, and staff who are committed to professional improvement through graduate education and through inservice and conference participation.

- Teachers and administrators actively pursue graduate degrees and/or coursework.
- Teachers and administrators attend state and local conferences regularly.
- Teachers and administrators give presentations at state and local conferences.
- PDS sites host conferences and special programs.
- Teachers and administrators are actively involved in inservice programs.

A professional development school should be highly involved in preservice teacher education.

- Teachers should regularly host preservice teachers in their classrooms.
- Teachers should be invited to and have confidence to provide critical feedback to preservice teachers.
- Teachers should play a role in both the practical and theoretical education of preservice teachers.
- Teachers should be interested and given the opportunity to exchange roles with university personnel.

A professional development school should provide a learning environment that supports all students and learning styles.

- Schools should promote individual learning styles.
- Schools are sensitive to diversity and celebrate differences as well as commonalties among students.

- Schools actively educate faculty, staff, and students on inclusion and special needs students.

A professional development school should model collaboration and teamwork.

- Teachers have respect for differences in teaching styles.
- Teachers engage in collaborative and cooperative teaching.
- Teachers engage in integrated instruction.

- The school community works on joint projects for service to the community and the betterment of learning and teaching experiences.
- Parents are encouraged to be regularly active in the classroom.

A professional development school should have close associations and exchanges with its university partner.

- Teachers should be given the opportunity to teach preservice teacher courses at the university.
- Teachers should invite university professors to engage in collaborative teaching in their classrooms and/or allow university professors to be guest teachers.
- Teachers and university persons should engage in collaborative on-site preservice teacher education.

College-Based Educator; Director PDS Program; PDS Liaison

A professional development school's program is:

- Composed of a community of learners (pupils in schools, students in universities, faculty in both schools and universities);
- collaborating on the creation of enhanced learning environments;
- based on a shared vision of teaching and learning;
- improved through reflection and inquiry.

In order to accomplish this perspective, the PDS partnership must have the following components:

A PDS partnership is based on a shared vision of teaching and learning.

Teaching is a highly complex process requiring the teacher to make many decisions aimed at facilitating the learning of all children and youth. Such a broad-based statement may be interpreted in many ways and implies a bias. A PDS partnership will discuss and shape a shared vision of teaching and learning and operate (make decisions about programs) based on that vision.

A PDS partnership has a mutually crafted reform agenda that links reform in schools to reform in educator preparation.

Reform in both schools and universities may be implemented without consideration of the impact of the reform on the other institution. Such action leads to disjointed and often competing reform agendas that fail to improve the practice of either institution. In a PDS partnership, specific communication channels are constructed that lead to the mutual creation of a reform agenda permitting practice to influence theory and theory to inform practice.

A PDS partnership promotes and sustains opportunities for continued growth and development of all professional educators (preservice, induction, and continued professional development) in the partnership.

Learning that is meaningful and connected to the life of the learner and engages the learner in the construction of the learning has a greater impact on the growth and development of the learner. In a PDS partnership, learning and growth activities (professional development) are selected, planned, and implemented by the learners within the partnership.

A PDS partnership contributes to the development of the knowledge base and practice of teaching through a program of collaborative inquiry and reflection.

Reflection and inquiry on practice is the primary way a profession grows in its ability to deliver its services. A PDS partnership will develop procedures designed to enable members to come together and systematically reflect and inquire in the practice of teaching and learning.

A PDS partnership is built and operates on relationships of parity and equity.

In a partnership between learning organizations, knowledge is the major capital. The individual perceived as having the most knowledge is also perceived as having the most power. Decisions regarding resources (time, money), access (who participates), curriculum (whose knowledge is most important), and assessment (whose judgment is followed) are often given over to those who are perceived as having the power to exercise decision making. Because the university rewards faculty for making their knowledge public and offering it for peer review, they are often perceived as having the power and school-based faculty defer to the decisions of the university faculty. A PDS partnership recognizes and promotes the strengths and knowledge, whether public or private, of all members of the partnership and creates an environment in which all have equal opportunities to influence and make decisions.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AT TERRE HAUTE

Group Responses

1. Equal stewardship and commitment to preservice teacher education.
    - Public school faculty teaching or co-teaching classes in teacher preparation program;
    - School faculty serving on university curriculum committees.
2. Spirit of inquiry and commitment to development of knowledge-base and practice.
    - Collaborative inquiry projects involving preservice students, school, and/or university faculty;
    - Empowering (giving "permission") to school faculty to inquire.
3. Continued professional development through a learning community.
    - Widescale participation in study groups;
    - Co-authoring or co-presenting findings and practices of schooling.
4. Shared vision of teaching and learning.
    - Common language and consistent philosophies;
    - Co-constructed perspective which is not dictated by one institution.
5. Focus on the learning of *all* children and youth served.
    - All faculty display the disposition of genuine concern for all students;
    - Recognize and accommodate diverse learning styles of students.
6. Concepts of egalitarian, parity, equity = collaboration and teamwork.
    - Mutual acceptance of responsibilities;
    - Incorporate "bottom-up" planning and decision-making.
7. Restructured roles of PDS participants.
    - Incorporate time during the instructional day for altered roles in decision-making and planning;
    - Expectations of the professoriate changed to be more reflective of roles expected in PDS work.
8. Documentation and reflection as a way to improve practice.
    - Using data to aid in making decisions regarding programs;
    - Cross-institutional teams doing documentation.

9. Modeling exemplary teaching.
   - School and university faculty knowledgeable about current trends in pedagogy;
   - Peer review of teaching.

10. Mutually linked reform agenda.
    - "Critical mass" of participants across and within partner institutions;
    - Institutional support (resources) from all partners to enact reform agenda.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA

Individual Responses

School-Based Educator; Cooperating Teacher; Co-Teacher of University Course

1. Collaborative Partners
   - Ongoing professional development for all levels: preservice, inservice teachers, university teachers—especially mentoring novice university teachers;
   - Partnership not hierarchical;
   - Collaborative goal setting by school teachers and college faculty;
   - Understand and respect balance of resources.

2. School Site as Extension of University
   - Teacher preparation classes on school site;
   - Peer coaching of faculty (college and school teacher teams);
   - Research based on school site.

3. University as Extension of School Site
   - Preservice students participate as members of governing council;
   - Shared responsibility for children;
   - Elementary students participant in university resources;
   - Summer institutes for teachers;
   - School-based teachers teaching university-based courses.

4. Education Is Process Not Product
   - Classroom teachers becoming aware and using university resources, e.g., pairing school-based teacher with university-based researcher;
   - University faculty doing demonstration lesson in school classroom.

Experienced Elementary School Teacher; School-Site Supervisor in PDS

A PDS is three kinds of community:

- A human community of understanding and acceptance;
- A process community of continual growth;
- A learning community of dialogue.

These play out in the following "specifics:"

- Instruction and support of cooperating teachers-written; verbal discussion and support; schedule of meetings, specifics of job;
- Support and dialogue to do the job (listeners);
- A staff that supports the community of cooperating teachers;
- A principal who believes in rejuvenating the field;
- Student teachers part of the school community, part of school family committees, PTA, family conferences, access to "guides" beyond cooperating teacher, connected with support staff of school (nurse, secretaries, special education);
- Supervisor who is part of school family;
- Supervisor connected with principal on continual basis;
- School-site teachers and university instructors connected, firsthand understanding of the program at both ends;
- School-based teacher educators able to meet with other school-based teacher educators to get ideas that might fit their particular school;
- Use of specific expertise at school site, e.g., list of places, people, and materials to contact for support;
- Community of trust—risk free environment where all can share concerns, celebrate, sink, or swim together;
- Actual physical space for materials, equipment, working area without getting in the way of each other.

School-Based Educator; Administrator of PDS School Site

The goal of a PDS:

- Improve teaching and learning;
- Act as agent for school reform;

- Reconceptualize teaching and learning;
- Simultaneous restructuring of teacher education and schooling.

Collaboration, Communication, Problem-Solving, Inquiry.
Indicators: Weekly time to meet together created with flexible use of time, planning and problem solving together; develop school and college curriculum together; student teachers doing "real work" together.

Shared/resources/knowledge
Indicators: Meshing of college and site courses; content and educational courses offered to teachers; college and school on committees together; writing and receiving grants together.

Common lens/blurring the roles
Indicators: School and college people serving multiple functions; merging theoretical and practical; use of common vocabulary.

Symbiotic relationship
Indicators: Mutual support; trust; working to meet the needs of the other.

Research
Indicators: Documentation; assessment; portfolio assessment of school and college program of teachers and student teachers.

Institutionalize changes in teaching and learning
Indicators: Curriculum reform; classroom practice; dissemination of change process learnings; sustain reform; send out seeds.

Teacher leadership
Indicators: Teachers teaching university coursework; on-site supervisors; inservice student teachers with classroom teachers; professionalism (time, money, and power).

Evolutionary infusion of energy, risk taking and development
Indicators: Ongoing dialogue; monthly meetings with cooperating teachers; monthly meetings with site-based school-based supervisor and student teachers.

Learning by active engagement in thinking, research, debate, and implementation
Indicators: Teaching at college; learning at college; debates on common issues; joint service on committees.

College-Based Educator; Director of Teacher Education Programs

Partnership

- Understand needs;

- Work through and with differences (agree to disagree but keep working together);
- Shared responsibility (work to meet the needs of the other, blurred roles);
- Shared governance (how decisions are made, how money is spent).

Program —College

- Theory and practice integrated (support cooperating teachers; co-teachers; concurrent coursework, and field placements);
- All children (admissions and assessments; financial and other support for student teachers of diverse backgrounds);
- Learner/learning centered (in the college classrooms).

Program —School

- All children (multicultural curriculum; authentic assessment; bilingual program; special education);
- Home/school partnerships;
- Learner/learning centered (in the classrooms).

Professional Commitments (visible in school and college)

- To clients—learner and learning centered

  learner = administrators, students, student teachers, teachers, teacher educators
  learning = powerful knowledge and skills to understand and manipulate their worlds;
- To best practice (buzz words = constructivist, holistic, integrated, and integrative);
- To inventing knowledge (joint system of rigorous inquiry into school program and classrooms, teacher education program and classrooms, campus program and classrooms);
- To profession (induction program; inservice opportunities; governance).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA

Group Responses

Summary of Discussion Concerning Agreed-Upon Standards

Each person presented his or her "standards" orally to the group. The initial response was that we were all saying the same thing using different language. As we spoke and probed deeper into our meaning, however, it became clear that the language differences between us were significant. We decided we were not actually "saying the same thing in a different language," but rather that the different languages we used allowed us to access complementary concepts.

We honored the task at hand by attempting to hammer out common language for our thoughts. We discovered that sometimes we could agree on words and a grammar to convey our meaning but conversely, that sometimes we were using the same words, phrases, and grammar to mean different things. We were, in effect, learning each other's language.

In our community, there is a public battle being waged about the nature and value of bilingual education. All of those in the conversation have taken public stances supporting the value of bilingualism that have made us acutely aware of the politics of language. Perhaps because of this, we began to think of our work together as learning a second language. The more we tried to find a common language, the more we began to understand the values of our separate languages and thus of being bilingual. Therefore, we consciously decided not to come to a common language for the following reasons:

- Each language, as a marker and maker of cultural meaning, is capable of particular elegance and nuances that the other languages are not. Coming up with one language loses some of those nuances that we believe provide the essential power of a professional development school.
- Choosing one language (even a hybrid language) inevitably privileges one language over another, which is antithetical to the values we share regarding a professional development school.
- One of the goals for our work together is to provide ourselves (school- and college-based educators) and our students (school children and prospective teachers) with multiple languages with which to enrich our work and our understanding of that work and our lives.

In summary, the process of collaboratively making visible our values and how we express them (e.g., setting standards) was a productive educational experience. It enriched our knowledge and ability to use a second (and sometimes a third) language as well as our understanding and use of our "home" language. At least for ourselves in this small setting, we are not certain that crafting a single language to express those values is as worthwhile an endeavor as using multiple languages to understand our inevitable and essential differences and in so doing, enrich our understandings of, and our ability to enact, our common values.

Inquiry and Professional Development Schools

Barnett Berry and Katherine Boles
with Kellah Edens, Annalee Nissenholtz, and Roberta Trachtman

INTRODUCTION

With virtually every education policy report, one hears calls for dramatic and simultaneous changes both in the public schools and in teacher education. To this end, many institutions that prepare teachers are now working with schools and school districts to create partnerships that forge high standards of teaching and learning. Today, the most distinct of these restructuring efforts are professional development schools (PDSs).

PDSs—collaborative enterprises of the public schools and higher education—provide rich, innovative settings to educate children at the same time that they serve as vehicles for communicating understandings of best teaching and learning practices. The concept of a PDS is not new. In the early 1900s, John Dewey proposed and initiated several laboratory schools—sites for research as well as for preparing new teachers, and jointly administered by schools and colleges (Winitzky, Stoddart, & O'Keefe, 1992). However, the lab schools, by and large, were too costly and they did not offer the time or rewards for sufficient faculty involvement (Page & Page, 1981). In addition, they were too far removed from the "mainstream of school life to be credible" (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990, p. 262). These experimental schools, which reached their peak in the 1960s, never fulfilled their research mission. As the demand for new teachers outstripped the lab schools' limited capacity to produce them, the role of research was lost as a priority and never institutionalized. In the late 1960s, the concept of a portal school emerged—with an emphasis on introducing new curricula and practices. Considerable effort was devoted to creating sophisticated organizational structures to support this new breed of school-university collaboration. However, very little substantive change materialized before financial support disappeared (Corrigan, 1992).

PDSs, which build upon these past efforts to improve and connect educational theory and practice, promise to be a different kind of partnership-based reform. PDSs are characterized by both the school and university:

- sharing a vision of teaching and learning;
- supporting universal student-centered education;
- focusing on the paramount value of educational equity;

- viewing teacher education as a developmental continuum for novices and experienced educators alike;
- ensuring parity in the university-school partnership such that there is an equitable distribution of commitment, influence, and resources; and
- using inquiry to establish and document best practices in teaching and learning as well as to assess the overall effects of PDSs on both student and adult learning.

This last characteristic—inquiry—is the focus of this chapter. We have come to believe that in many ways inquiry is (or must be) the *sine qua non* of PDSs. With inquiry emerges the possibility of quality assurance, when those who are responsible for delivering quality education:

- use inquiry as a means to transform day-to-day teaching and learning practices;
- engage in collaborative inquiry to determine what works best (or doesn't) for students; and
- conduct inquiry on the effects of PDSs on teaching and learning.

These three dimensions do not unfold as neat and tidy analytic dimensions. Although these three dimensions overlap considerably, they present different ways of viewing inquiry and describing and assessing current practices. Our purpose here is to clarify what is understood about PDS inquiry and suggest ways to focus future practice and policy. We do so by reporting on and analyzing both the current literature as well a recent survey (administered by the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education) of 28 peer-nominated sites that sought to document and understand their policies and practices (including those related to inquiry).

Bullough and his colleagues' (1996) study of change in PDSs suggests that generating models may be an "illusion" due to the "messy, context-sensitive, and dynamic and unpredictable nature of PDS work" (p. 2). We recognize the limitations with our own work in this regard, but do hope we can locate and illustrate some of the more critical issues related to PDS inquiry. With these caveats in mind, we offer a "snapshot" of critical images concerning the nature of PDS inquiry and what it means for identifying and supporting PDSs.

WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL INQUIRY

Teitel (1996), in his review of almost 200 references to PDSs, found that while inquiry is oft-cited as a critical goal, few reports point to any substantive relationship between the inquiry process and student learning. Teitel's review clearly signals the potential problem of continuing to create and sustain PDSs if there is no evidence of a direct impact on student learning. Although, there are many changes in the new world of PDSs, documentation of inquiry models appears less developed than other PDS dimensions. One recent report suggests that the PDS provides:

> . . . (an increased) amount of time spent by preservice teachers in schools, more planned and purposeful experiences for student teachers, a greater focus on the whole school as the placement site, an increased emphasis on collaboration among teachers and peers, greater access to university supervisors, a greater respect for teacher knowledge and more decision making about the program by school staff, and more access to workshops and seminars on mentoring student teachers (Zeichner and Miller, as cited in Teitel, 1996, p. 12).

In some cases, there is activity surrounding action research and other forms of school-based inquiry. However, the PDS literature suggests considerable ambiguity as to the role, type, and effects of inquiry on teaching and learning practices as well as on teacher education reform. Defining inquiry is hindered by the overall problem that plagues this particular educational reform: what is meant and delivered by these school-university partnerships that actually define them as PDSs. Reviewers have claimed that it is almost impossible to find a site that excels in all areas—including inquiry—even in some of the more well developed and supported sites (e.g., those partnerships associated with the National Network for Educational Renewal) (Osguthorpe, Harris, Harris, & Black, 1995).

Our review of the recently assembled PDS site surveys reveals that the respondents had some difficulty in describing their inquiry efforts. In terms of the written narrative responses, only a few sites seemed to be able to delve deeply into inquiry in any significant way. The follow-up telephone interviews helped in our understanding. However, there were considerable differences in the responses in terms of the dimension of inquiry described. We have categorized those dimensions as follows.

Inquiry As. To a certain degree, inquiry as teaching and learning was easily described, given the abundance of rhetorical (but not necessarily substantive) proxies for the concept of teaching for understanding, e.g., whole language, child-centered curriculum, use of manipulatives, etc. However, the more powerful examples of "inquiry as" appeared to reveal more than just an increase in teachers' repertoire of strategies to best meet the learning needs of individual students. In these instances, PDS participants could articulate how inquiry as teaching and learning could be used as a tool to confront incompatible beliefs and actions. Perhaps importantly, those PDS sites that could clearly articulate how both children and adults create knowledge seemed to be making more progress on a sustained and coherent inquiry agenda. (One explanation may be that because inquiry in these sites is more culturally embedded, the respondents were more adept at writing and talking about inquiry.)

Inquiry In. By far, inquiry in teaching and learning was most evident and easily described with general examples of action research projects, case studies, collaborative teaching, curriculum redesign, and authentic forms of student assessment, conducted in some part by teachers, teacher educators, and prospective teachers.

Inquiry On. Finally, inquiry on the effects of the PDS was the least described dimension, with less than a handful of the 28 site respondents describing specific research that informs both practice and policy in a significant and sustained manner. A number of sites clearly recognized the need for this much neglected form of inquiry. However, even when inquiry on teaching and learning was under way it was difficult to ascertain how the sites were reporting and using the data. So, in this particular instance, quality assurance was necessarily limited.

The PDS sites did not seem to be progressing very far with inquiry in and inquiry on teaching and learning if they were not simultaneously working on inquiry as a means to transform day-to-day teaching and learning. The importance of this particular dimension of inquiry cannot be underemphasized. It is the focus on teaching and learning as inquiry itself that provides the foundation for more thoughtful and potentially powerful approaches to inquiry in and on PDSs. These are not mere semantical differences. It is critical for both school-based and university-based faculty to think of their day-to-day practice as a constant form of inquiry in order for them to produce quality research in and on their efforts. However, the value of inquiry may not necessarily be expressed in terms of a written product. The inquiry is valuable when the results of the inquiry are made public and used in the best interests of all students. However, as the (few) sites were able to go "more public" in writing with what they were learning from these three inquiry dimensions, they also seemed to become more powerful in terms of defining their PDSs as unique and important.

None of the sites was without problems and pitfalls, and virtually all faced the similar barriers of budget and bureaucracies as well as the ubiquitous lack of time and rewards. But, it was those sites which were "more together" on the matters of inquiry as teaching and learning that appeared to better confront and cope with these barriers. In turn, it was these sites that seemed to develop more commitment from diverse participants and stakeholders.

What follows are some of the particulars of what we learned from the literature as well as the sites' descriptions of these three inquiry dimensions.

INQUIRY AS A MEANS TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Holmes Group(1990) as well as a host of other reform advocates call for PDSs to be model sites for what has been called "teaching for understanding." These words are synonymous with inquiry-based teaching and learning whereby teachers draw upon multiple forms of pedagogy in order to engage all students in understanding, using, and creating knowledge in real-world contexts. This type of teaching requires highly-skilled practitioners to "inquire" regularly, because only by constantly questioning what is being done and how every student learns can teachers fulfill the promise of teaching for understanding. Thus, the roots of inquiry as teaching and learning can be found in the belief that all participants associated with the school, adults and children alike, are continuous learners.

Inquiry as teaching and learning is precisely what Sirotnik (1987) had in mind when he claimed that "people who live and work in complex organizations like schools need to be thoroughly involved in their own improvement efforts...(and become) active critical consumers of their own and others' knowledge in the context of their own practices and the changing of these practices" (p. 27). Teitel refers to the work of Schaefer (1967) in his concept of the school as a "center of inquiry," since teachers "should conduct inquiry routinely as a mechanism to understand and assess the teaching and learning process" (p. 16).

Thus, for teachers at the school and university, the hallmark of this form of teaching is constantly questioning what is taught and why. Kimball, Swap, LaRosa, and Howrick (as cited in Teitel, 1996) suggest a rather modest, but potentially powerful foray into inquiry as teaching and learning; the use of self-assessments by both pre- and inservice teachers of their own practices in order to create opportunities to learn more about how students learn. However, inquiry as teaching and learning is more than just new practices by teachers. Students also are expected to constantly question what is learned and why. For teachers and students alike, teaching and learning emerges as a continual opportunity to become the center of change, not the object of it. The conception of inquiry as teaching and learning can be the driving force for continuous improvement.

A powerful example of inquiry as teaching and learning can be found in the descriptions of Central Park East Secondary School (CPESS), one of the initial schools associated with the Coalition of Essential Schools (Meier, 1995; Lieberman, 1995a). CPESS supports a culture of inquiry by expecting both students and educators to question themselves and challenge received opinion. This does not mean that there is a blanket disregard for the teacher as a noted authority by students, but there is an expectation that the disciplined arguments (made by educators and students) are cast "based upon evidence" not just "assumptions." If a culture of inquiry exists and is to affect student learning, Lieberman (1995a) suggests that one might see (1) students and teachers challenging each other, (2) debates based upon evidence (in classrooms and conferences), (3) teachers questioning students' habits of work, (4) students working on substantive research (e.g., carrying disks, portfolios), and (5) faculty engaged in debate over what is acceptable work and performance for students and themselves.

Meier (1995) suggests that the school as a center of inquiry must be driven by habits of mind attended to by adults and children alike. Currently, the CPESS curriculum for students and professional development for teachers is framed by five habits of mind:

- From whose perspective are we considering (reading, studying, etc.)?
- How do we know what we know? Where is the evidence?
- How are these issues or facts connected? What do they have to do with each other?
- Are there other ways of looking at it? Are there alternative explanations? Can things be otherwise?
- Who cares? What does it mean? So what? What does it matter?

In this view, inquiry is what folks in school do, e.g., how students learn history (or any other discipline for that matter), how teachers develop curriculum, or how students and adults reach important decisions concerning their school and place of work.

With these new and more powerful conceptions of inquiry as teaching and learning, PDSs are suggested to be a venue for socializing new and experienced teachers for new roles and responsibilities based on more ambitious conceptions of student learning. With a focus on inquiry-based teaching and learning, PDSs can promote new beliefs and actions on the part of teachers, who heretofore tended to draw upon traditional teaching paradigms (e.g., teaching as telling) that may stifle learning for many students.

The survey results revealed clear descriptions of student learning defined as inquiry. Reports of children expected to work independently on difficult tasks, engaged in inquiry-based science projects, and using technology to create knowledge were typical examples. In one site, there were vivid descriptions of students using the Internet as a research tool and conducting collaborative research projects (e.g., one on weather tracking) as well as using hypermedia for presentation of products and evidence of learning.

In another example, through the use of miscue analysis, inquiry has changed practice in the area of literacy assessment. In this instance, the elementary school students are more accurately placed and instructed, and the teacher education students are able to observe a specific instructional and assessment model that specifically expands their teaching repertories and conception of learning. This process defines how teachers teach and how students are expected to learn.

In another site, a regularly scheduled "child study" was used as the venue for assessing where students were, and what the educators needed to do differently. Importantly, organizational time was carved out for such practice. In the same site that conducts the "child study," the intern presence allows for more adults responsible for teaching the same children, school-based faculty are provided a full day of professional development per week, inquiry groups meet every three weeks for three hours, and five hours a month are devoted to address larger issues of curriculum and pedagogy. These are not insignificant organizational changes supportive of inquiry. Teacher inquiry is not left to chance. In doing so, "teachers are constantly examining and changing their practice," and the structure of the intern-mentor relationship "forces everyone to think about their practice," reported survey participants.

But, inquiry as teaching and learning was more than just students engaged in a thoughtful, constructivist curriculum. A defining feature of inquiry as teaching and learning was teachers, teacher educators, and prospective teachers working together to examine the student work in light of what the students knew and should be doing. As suggested previously, teachers must "inquire" regularly about how students learn and how they should teach in order to model the kinds of thinking and action for students in their own inquiry-based learning. One PDS reported:

> One of our PDS sites is a member of the Accelerated Schools Network, which utilizes a governance structure that uses cadres to inquire into the challenges the school faces. The cadres help bridge inquiry as teaching and learning and inquiry in teaching and learning. The data (primarily qualitative) obtained from their inquiry process is to focus on needs related to (1) parent involvement, (2) discipline and climate issues, and (3) curriculum. The inquiry method is used to systematically look at the challenge, talk about it, obtain information, and determine what could be implemented to solve the problem of the challenge. Students also use inquiry to investigate questions and problems relevant to their learning.
>
> Inquiry efforts are openly discussed and shared not only within these cadres but also in grade team meetings, Wednesday afternoon conversations, and other forums during which staff discuss pertinent issues and concerns. Student teachers regularly participate in many of these exchanges.
>
> The school is guided by the overarching view of teaching and learning advocated by national standards, but does so primarily because of its involvement as an Accelerated School and because of the view of teaching and learning held by teachers.

These possibilities of inquiry as teaching and learning emerge more prominently when teacher education students work more closely with a cohort of peers and have a stronger bond with their school-based and university-based mentors. In turn, these inquiry possibilities escalate dramatically when the school and the university have arranged for real mentoring time for those who must work with, support, and assess these prospective teachers.

Similarly, structural rearrangements are essential to establishing each of the dimensions of inquiry. But, in particular, establishing inquiry as teaching and learning appeared to be supported by long-term relationships between adults and children, e.g., whereby a specific class of students will stay with a teacher for a period of two to three years. With this structural arrangement, teachers are more likely to know their students in ways that support the use of inquiry-based teaching. For example, in one site where the school has created multi-age groupings for students, teachers are now keeping more detailed and complex records of students' progress, and in doing so, claim "to know their students better than they ever had before."

External standards can be important as well. There were clear examples of how curriculum (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics [NCTM] curriculum standards), school reform (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools), or teacher education (e.g., Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards were used to promote a different way of thinking and acting on program quality and inquiry. In some sites, efforts have been made to compare the math standards (both the NCTM and state framework) to the kind of teaching and learning promoted by commercially published and other locally developed curricular materials.

Others recognized the fact that they are not "far enough along" in using external standards. In one site, respondents claimed the external standards they used are "so internalized" they may not be visible to outsiders or to novices.

We also found in some sites that high-stakes basic-skills tests could emerge as a more powerful frame for the PDS inquiry efforts, and thereby, countermand more ambitious curriculum standards suggested by the NCTM. A majority of the site respondents lamented the obstacle of statewide testing as a barrier and, to some extent, a negatively-focused external standard. In one site, a respondent noted, "We are being held to the mat on standardized test scores. We must have assessments, but our discussions about inquiry become quite heated when it comes to testing and assessment. I am not against standardized tests, but they should not drive the system."

In this context, inquiry as teaching and learning may seem quite broad; how teachers analyze student work, reach important decisions, develop curriculum, and change their own practices. Here the lines between inquiry as and inquiry in become quite blurred. In one site, we learned of this initial view evolving into the conception of classroom teachers as "teacher researchers," with teachers maintaining journals and anecdotal records regarding individual pupils and/or group reactions to varying instructional strategies. In this site, the inquiry mindset and actions are extended by case studies and other research in order "to validate and substantiate best instructional practices." In the sites that seem to have more developed conceptions of inquiry, there is clear evidence that teaching and learning are "clearly informed by a knowledge base." Thereby, inquiry as teaching and learning is more readily translated into inquiry in teaching and learning.

COLLABORATIVE 'INQUIRY IN' TO DETERMINE WHAT WORKS BEST

Teitel (1996) suggests there is a literature stream that distinguishes PDS inquiry from the more traditional forms of the "ivory tower" research conducted on schools. For example, the "ivory tower" research design has the outside expert (i.e., university researcher) examining and critiquing what the (perceived) less-knowledgeable insider (i.e., school practitioner) does in educating students. Instead, PDSs, as Teitel reports, become the ***raison d'être*** for a new form of inquiry, which by design has both university and school faculty collaboratively defining and investigating matters of import for the student, school, and the profession.

Kimball et al. (as cited in Teitel, 1996) has described a variety of approaches used by the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) partnership in enhancing outcomes, which are in essence examples of PDS inquiry in teaching and learning:

- collaborative teaching teams of interns and regular classroom teachers making joint decisions regarding curriculum and pedagogy, or
- a collaborative decision-making body conducting a survey concerning current practices in order to enhance teaching and learning.

Teitel (1996) reports the work of Hunkins and others and their delineation of three areas of inquiry in NNER partner schools:

- inquiry into the partnership process, including studies of parity between schools and universities as well as the relationships among students, faculty, and administrators across inter- and intra-institutional lines;
- inquiry into professional development, focusing on how novice and experienced teachers as well as teacher educators learn new practices; and
- inquiry into best practices, centering primarily on the effects of particular curricular or pedagogical initiatives.

The literature suggests that inquiry in teaching and learning can be as "simple" as a collaborative team of new and experienced educators making thoughtful and disciplined classroom decisions based on reasoned evidence. For example, inquiry in teaching and learning can be represented by teachers sitting around a conference table, debating the merits of student work in one of their regularly scheduled portfolio review sessions, and discussing how they must change their practices in order to enhance the student's performance. However, inquiry in teaching and learning can also be as complex as a sophisticated action research project that draws upon multiple methods and far-reaching dissemination strategies.

In these instances, these are very subtle differences with the previously described conception of inquiry as a means to improve teaching and learning. Inquiry as teaching and learning may not be collaborative, and it may be more easily viewed in singular classrooms. However, inquiry in teaching and learning involves increasing levels of actions outside a single classroom. While inquiry as teaching and learning may be a private affair, inquiry in teaching and learning is a more public one.

For example, Snyder, Lieberman, Macdonald, and Goodwin (1992) have described the Descriptive Review Process (DRP) used at Central Park East Elementary School "to keep the school responsible and responsive to the value of each individual" (p. 66). The primary purpose of the DRP is to bring together varied perspectives, in a collaborative process, in order to describe a child's experience within the school setting. The child is described fully in as "balanced a way as possible" in order to "gain access to the child's modes of thinking and learning and to see their world from their point of view: what catches their attention; what arouses their wonder and curiosity; what sustains their interest and purpose" (p. 74). Here, both forms of inquiry are present and build upon each other.

Similarly, Falk (1994) describes the documentation of children's learning as the foundation of assessment at The Bronx New School. Teachers and school support staff representing all grade levels utilize multiple sources of information collected over a prolonged length of time, including teacher-maintained observations, student-maintained records, and samples of student work as well as regular input from students' families. Focus is on the students' accomplishments along with their special strengths and the strategies utilized in their learning, all grounded in a developmental framework. These data are used to plan appropriate learning experiences and to develop a responsive curriculum. The assessment system provides occasions for reflection, learning, and communication by documenting the progress of groups of children, involving families in all school activities, and encouraging teachers to reflect about assessments of children and their work.

This type of inquiry is professional development in and of itself. In this regard, professional development derived from serious inquiry into best practices provides a framework for experienced teachers to socialize novices as well as to become leaders in their profession. Thus, in this regard, professional development based on study groups, action research, peer observations, and peer reviews of "case management" of student progress all become possibilities for inquiry in teaching and learning as well as levers for teacher leadership.

Meier (1995) argues that there is no clear dividing line between professional development and curriculum development and student assessment. She suggests that curriculum must evolve from a "continuing dialogue and conversation" among teachers and, as such, the lines of distinction between curriculum development and professional development begin to blur.

For PDSs, these types of inquiry efforts require collaboration within and between the respective school and university partners. However, as Rafferty (as cited in Teitel, 1996) notes, collaborative inquiry is particularly difficult because the respective organizational cultures of schools and universities promote highly divergent views of what is useful research. As Stoddart (1993) claims, even when more collaborative inquiry emerges, the university partner generally is the one responsible for primary authorship of the report itself. Teitel (1996) reports that collaborative inquiry is still highly problematic. Wiseman (1993) reports that even when school and university partners function on the same inquiry "wavelength," the larger institutional reward structures continue to work at odds with the inquiry efforts. There is substantial anecdotal evidence that junior university faculty members are reluctant to conduct field-based, collaborative inquiry suggested by PDS reforms, since their institutions continue to value traditional modes of research publications in the tenure and promotion process.

The school reform literature is replete with references to the lack of support for teachers to engage in inquiry. For example, Meier (1995) claims that until schools (including PDSs) alter the ratio of novices to experts and provide more opportunities for novices to try out what they see experts doing, professional development (and consequently, inquiry) will continue to be highly problematic. However, carving out organizational time for teachers to work with other teachers continues to be a major problem. Although not well documented in the literature, anecdotal evidence suggests that school board members and school administrators frown upon any activity that necessitates a teacher from spending "school time" that is not in direct contact with students.

University-based faculty have more time to engage in PDS inquiry and they clearly are supported organizationally for research efforts. However, other factors limit their capacity to collaborate easily with school-based faculty in PDS inquiry. While there are reports that PDS-type research is increasingly gaining stature at some universities (Case, Norlander, & Reagan, 1993), little is known about the full impact of the perceived lack of support for PDS-based inquiry in terms of tenure, promotion, and rewards for university and school faculty alike. Again, anecdotal evidence suggests the kinds of research generated in typical PDS inquiry may not be valued by universities that cling to more traditional notions of scholarship. These universities and their tenure and promotion criteria may support single-authored experimentally designed studies published in refereed academic journals at the expense of collaborative PDS inquiry projects, using more non-traditional methodologies "published" in technical reports, conference proceedings, or widely read, but non-refereed educational journals.

Many of these issues surfaced in the NCATE surveys. The sites reported a range of "inquiry in" questions: What role does available technology play in our teaching and curricular designs? Why are our students doing so poorly in formal test settings where their writing skills are evaluated? What do we need to do to help our students become better writers? How has being a part of a collaborative program changed teachers' professional careers? How can our PDS staff be of service to tenured teachers in the district who have been evaluated as being in need of mentoring/assistance? In this particular instance, data collected included artifacts, student and staff surveys, journals and anecdotal records, interviews, and observations of classroom and other contexts.

Teachers inquire about student needs through various formal, informal, and authentic assessment techniques, including portfolios, individual conferences, miscue analysis, observations, and interviews. In one site, questions have been asked about topics such as student grouping, learner-centered curriculum, multi-age grouping, thematic instruction, inclusion, journals, and portfolios. In this instance, data collected included student surveys, teacher surveys, teacher journals, interviews, work samples, and behavioral observations. With more time and organizational support, some sites have been able to translate the results of their "inquiry in" into case studies, videotapes, presentations at state and national conferences.

This type of inquiry can be powerful and create a number of opportunities and possibilities. One PDS educator told us:

> The inquiry team evolved as teacher education students, professors, and school faculty began to have questions about whole language and skills.
>
> A small group began their inquiry in teaching and learning with a lunch meeting, then a trip to New Orleans to the National Reading Conference There were five teachers, a student teacher, and a university faculty member. This group of

> five teachers and university people continues to work, meeting weekly. Their work has never been university imposed.
>
> Now there is a "learning coordinator"—a classroom teacher who is freed up by the interns. The coordinator works with other teachers, university faculty, and the interns. The teacher education students are real interns who are paid for half-time teaching and receive heavy mentoring during their full-year internship.
>
> Classroom teachers in our PDS are working to create their own master's program—allowing them to do their graduate work without leaving the classroom.

The above example of translating inquiry and professional development was more the exception than the norm. Few sites indicated they had or could create sufficient time and organizational supports to make such transformations.

Even when it is rather clear that this inquiry-based information is used to inform instruction, the evidence is sometimes difficult to see and understand. "Inquiry in" is viewed as a strategy to improve the practice of teaching. However, methodologies are not always clear, other than describing the product or the reporting of the perceptions of different consumers (K-12 students, teacher education graduates) and stakeholders (parents, administrators, etc.). A range of topics is explored, and a number of measures appear to be deployed; but the effects appear to be somewhat slim (at least through the particular medium of the narrative survey data). The connections between inquiry-in student learning and inquiry-in adult learning are even less apparent. In only a few sites, it became clear that inquiry in teaching and learning was shaping and being shaped by professional development. In one site where inquiry-in teaching and learning is making a difference, we were told how the transformations took place:

> The PDS faculty are grounding their curriculum reform efforts in such noteworthy external standards, as those promulgated by the National Council of Teachers of English. The Writing (and Reading) Workshop is now being used as an exemplar strategy. In addition to regular and constant attention to mandated standardized test data, documentation includes a wide range of indicators, focusing on curriculum materials, teaching strategies, and student behavior.
>
> Inquiry findings are openly discussed—in committee meetings among school-based and university-based faculty and are facilitated by the site's involvement in both a national and a statewide network for teacher education reform. The network provides a formal way to communicate and fosters informal and ongoing communication. Co–teaching with school-based and university-based faculty has occurred as a direct spin-off of the

> sharing of inquiry efforts. Inquiry is increasingly framed by the site's involvement with the National Education Association's PDS program assessment model as well as the NCTE standards.
>
> Now, there is much discussion about the PDS site being designated as the site for staff development in the district, which will translate into additional dollars, which are sorely needed. The PDS provides scaffolding for new teachers by having six coordinators who exchange roles with the new teachers. The new teachers can then participate in a variety of professional development opportunities and are provided with a follow-through program to assist in the implementation of new strategies. Inquiry and professional development are beginning to emerge as synonymous initiatives.

Inquiry-in teaching and learning, as one site reported, is used "to guide practice, just as practice may guide what we decide to inquire about." In this instance, “inquiry in” is used to examine the preservice teacher education program and to question what contributes to a good elementary education program. So, as inquiry becomes more a part of the PDS culture, one should expect to see as much inquiry into university practices as into school practices. After all, simultaneous renewal of P–12 and teacher education programs involves the same questions about teaching and learning, and finding answers to these questions will contribute to a greater understanding of the teaching and learning process for young and adult learners alike.

In one site, student teachers are assessed in a variety of ways. The cooperating teacher follows a coaching model in assisting the student teacher in reflecting on his or her performance. Teacher and student teacher use a collaborative journal in which reflections, revisions, and celebrations are shared. This is an essential part of the inquiry process in their particular PDS.

At another site, because teacher education courses themselves are viewed as alternative educational experiences, teacher education students work on a variety of inquiry projects to support school reform (e.g., developing a conflict resolution curriculum, compiling a portfolio for implementing new graduation requirements, and researching and developing performance indicators). In this same site, professional development as a whole is expected to change teaching practices, and PDS practitioners have far more control over district staff-development dollars. With this kind of power and authority, the school has been able to leverage inquiry in teaching and learning as a way to change pre-service and inservice education simultaneously.

At another site, inquiry is openly discussed and shared through "learning circles," which provide formal and specific opportunities for teachers to learn from each other.

Teachers are given an inservice credit for 15 hours of participation in a learning circle, which suggests district support for inquiry sharing. The learning circles have a specified agenda and structure (reviews of literature and focused discussion) all resulting in inquiry projects related to building specific PDS goals.

Finally, in another, seemingly well-developed site, inquiry appears to be going on, but the survey respondents lamented that "formal action research does not occur often." In this site, training for action research does not exist, the school district does not evaluate programs in ways consistent with the PDS, and formal research in schools is not highly valued by many participants and stakeholders. Despite these significant barriers, close and increasingly trusting relationships between a growing (and critical) number of school-based and university-based faculty help them pursue their individual inquiry projects.

But, in the majority of the sites, parity problems between the school and the university create a number of other obstacles for inquiry in teaching and learning. One manifestation of this problem is the heavy emphasis placed on inquiry in P-12 settings, as opposed to inquiry in teacher education (or the larger university) settings. In most cases, it is the P-12 school that is assessed, not the university. This imbalance largely is reflected in existing hierarchical relationships between the university and the school. (Many school-based faculty still look to the university for the inquiry expertise, further exacerbating the traditional hierarchical relationship between K-12 and postsecondary education.) One example of this critical issue is illuminated by the following report from one PDS site:

> Eight teachers were to work on action research projects in their PDS. These teachers chose their own topic and a university colleague guided them through the process. They met individually with their instructor (university colleague) and as a group. All went well until the time came for the teachers to write up their findings. All of the teachers passively resisted. The teachers complained that they were not given enough direction and griped that although they were told that the PDS venture would be a cooperative one, the university faculty member created a hierarchical relationship that resembled a teacher-student relationship. Meanwhile, the faculty member complained that after she volunteered her time, the teachers were not acting professionally and were just trying to get out of doing the work. She was very disappointed.
>
> Thus, miscommunications abounded. Teachers alleged that they were expected to demonstrate principles they did not understand—engaging in inquiry, reflective journaling, moving from practice to theory, etc. After numerous meetings, the university faculty member and the teachers reached a compromise. Eventually all the teachers did turn in their projects, but, several admitted the "insecurity" they felt. Some were concerned that their work

> "was not very good," or that they were "a really bad writer." They feared having their work judged. The university co-worker's opinion was important to them, and they were afraid she would think less of them as professionals.

In another site, it was clear that inquiry in teaching and learning is the responsibility of university faculty and teacher education students, a finding consistent with the site's report that the school-based faculty view university-based faculty as the primary source of information and inquiry. As one site respondent noted, "It is sometimes difficult to overcome preconceived ideas about the university as the experts and the schools as being below the university." In these cases, it is not surprising that school practices, not university ones, become the target of inquiry.

At a number of other sites, inquiry in teaching and learning appears to be limited by the fact that the old model of cooperating teacher/ student teacher exhibits little (if any) indication of changing. The surveys did not specifically ask the question of how the student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship was different in a PDS. But only in a few instances did the respondents write about specific changes in these roles.

It seems that those few sites which are making the most progress, and where more school-based faculty are the major "change-makers" conducting teacher-directed inquiry, the teachers feel they have more freedom and responsibility with regard to teacher education decisions including the selection, training, and evaluation of prospective teachers. It is almost as if breaking the old hierarchical relationships at any point can be a leverage point for more collaborative inquiry and the development of inquiry on PDSs.

To use an analogy from cinematography, the shift from inquiry in to inquiry on requires that the PDS site zoom out and pan, thus capturing a global view of that particular PDS and perhaps PDSs in general. Inquiry is a means of collaborative pulse-taking to challenge the *status quo* and to understand and explain the particular relative to the general. This viewpoint, of course, is in stark contrast to the close-up shot of the inquiry in, in which analysis of a specific component of teaching and/or learning is conducted. We found the possibilities of inquiry connections in one site where:

> Action research plays an important role at the school. The total staff and preservice students are involved in collaborative action research. Preservice teachers are included in the mentor teacher team research project during the first quarter, then conduct their own individual action research project the second and third quarters. The collaborative is in the process of developing a research project to assess the effectiveness of the partnership.

INQUIRY ON THE EFFECTS OF THE PDS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Inquiry on the effects of PDSs refers to the assessment of PDSs in and of themselves especially as the efforts relate to enhanced student learning and/or the relationship between the learning of the adult and the children. Teitel (1996) is quick to point out that there are "very few evaluations of PDSs in the literature" (p, 26).

Because of limited research in the past on the work and progress of both the lab and portal schools, these efforts contributed little to the development of theory in teacher education (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990). With little research on their effectiveness, few past lessons have been transformed into guides for future practice and the current efforts to create and sustain PDSs. And, without hard evidence of the benefits to students, prospective teachers, and teachers, those who wish to create and sustain PDSs have little ground to stand on as they seek financial and political support for such ambitious changes in schools and teacher education. Today, despite all the recent activity nationwide concerning PDSs, too little is known about them and their effects on teachers and the students they serve.

Currently, Teitel (1996) suggests that "because of the context for the formation of many PDSs, it is often difficult to say with complete certainty that the establishment of a PDS led to improved approaches to student learning. Many changes either pre-date PDS or run concurrent with it" (p. 10).

Teitel (1996) reports that few studies have set up meaningful comparison groups for assessing the impact of PDSs. He claims that few PDSs collected the baseline data necessary for the kinds of studies needed. Instead, most studies attempt to measure attitudinal changes among participants. These measures are not irrelevant, but they do little to provide the kind of evidence needed to transform practice and policy as well as the political support necessary for sustained PDS reform efforts. The preponderance of inquiry on PDSs has been framed by attitudinal surveys of and interviews with participants or summaries of action research reports. There appears to be a reluctance among those who are creating PDSs to open up their institutional efforts to outside scrutiny.

Ishler and Edens (1995) suggest that "the model adopted for the evaluation of PDSs should include the identification of authentic indicators of the processes used in the collaboration and of the extent to which the simultaneous renewal has improved the school and the teacher education program" (p. 36). Their report for the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges identified a set of questions to frame the evaluation of PDSs:

- To what extent and in what ways have simultaneous renewal been enhanced in IHEs and P-12 schools working together in PDSs?
- To what extent and in what ways are teacher candidates at PDS sites prepared to assume responsibility for a classroom?
- In what ways have PDS teachers and students been influenced or affected by the PDS collaboration?

However, more often than not, most inquiry on PDSs has revealed that the partnerships may be nothing more than an enhanced form of student teaching (see Shen, as cited in Teitel, 1996) or their efforts may provide slightly more focused and teacher-friendly professional development. However, in one of the few studies where multiple and independent measures were used to judge PDS effectiveness, the researchers found that there were improvements in actual classroom teaching (by student teachers and their cooperating teachers) and that PDS graduates (when compared to non PDS-graduates) were ranked higher on measures of classroom performance by their principals (Stallings, as cited in Teitel, 1996).

Nevertheless, the changes resulting from PDS partnerships can be ephemeral and causal linkages "squishy" at best. For example, PDS-inspired action research projects and the influx of a cadre of student interns may be associated with the development and dissemination of teacher learning. More than anything else, the venue of the research project (as a graduate course offered on site) and the out-of-class time afforded for teachers (as the interns covered their classrooms) can appear to make the difference in both professional development, and ultimately, teacher professionalism (Berry & Catoe, 1994). However, most evaluation designs of PDS efforts could not uncover (and/or prove) that it was indeed the PDS model, and not other school restructuring activities, that explicitly linked teacher learning with enhanced student outcomes.

To prove the effectiveness of the PDS model will require much more complex models as well as intensive efforts in evaluation and assessment, areas historically neglected in schools. However, in some cases, inroads are being made, with one promising example found in the Accelerated Schools model. In this model, evaluation and assessment are vital components of every activity. However, the difficulty of creating sustained and connected assessments is striking. Levin (1996) claims that the assessments "must address the needs of multiple stakeholders, multiple methodologies for addressing those needs, and multiple measures for evaluating results." For example, to ascertain how classroom practices are changing, there must be observations and interviews; to understand student achievement, there must be some form of statistical design used to ferret out non-school influences; to present relevant information to parents, real student work samples must be assessed, scored, and reported; and to listen to what students need, they must be surveyed and interviewed.

To frame such an effort, the Accelerated Schools Project uses a "toolkit for self-assessment" that draws on questionnaires, a coach's (external facilitator) log, a school data portfolio, school documents, and benchmarks. This type of inquiry on teaching and learning can be used for multiple purposes and audiences; and most notably, "builds on the strengths existing within an accelerated school, rather than creating an assessment mechanism that is developed outside of school experience and then imposed on a school" (Accelerated School Project Newsletter, 1996, p. 10). This approach would have a salubrious effect on PDS inquiry, supporting all three dimensions simultaneously.

Again, many of the same issues described in the literature were born out in the NCATE survey data. For example, in most cases, even when there was a great deal of inquiry occurring, the survey data did not reveal how these newfound data sources were used to assess the overall effects of the PDS effort and to inform future policy.

In some sites, successful outcomes were claimed, noting considerable achievements related to standardized test scores, students' self-esteem, higher ratings for teacher education graduates, and the like. One site, reported that since becoming a PDS, standardized test scores had risen, attendance improved, students were more positive toward learning, violence and vandalism had decreased, and parental participation had increased. Again, there was a question as to how the PDS had accomplished these feats.

Very few sites could describe in detail the inquiry on teaching and learning. Perhaps, this should not be surprising, given the newness (of a number) of the sites, and the more substantial commitment required from participants and stakeholders alike to engage in tough questioning of their efforts. These sites, like many schools and universities across America, struggle with what Ann Lieberman (1995a) calls a culture of review, or what we call "going public." Yet, it is clear as the sites develop, they must understand the importance of such review. A number have reported the unfolding of formal evaluation plans, beginning in spring 1996. (Several of the sites reviewed are part of a massive "documentation" project led by the National Educational Association.)

In one site, the PDS participants were recognizing that one important outcome of "being a PDS" was that their students (children) received "more adult help and nurturing because of the time that college students spend in the classroom." Now, a formal evaluation plan is being formulated that will document the degree to which the intellectual growth of all the participants is supported by the PDS. The site reports that data will include surveys, interviews, observations, tests, and assessments of college and elementary students' portfolios, and conversations among the university-based and school-based faculty, school administrators, and teacher education students. One of the PDS sites, described as a self-directed school, is developing a culture of looking outward and sharing lessons:

> Being a self-directed school is a concept that appears to drive the curriculum and inquiry. For participants in this school, inquiry is an integral and necessary part of the change process. The school is organized into clusters—groups of individuals who share an interest and focus in a particular area. The clusters form on an as-needed basis and individuals self-select for particular clusters. Examples of clusters are curriculum, professional development, action research, higher-order thinking, diversity, technology, and student assessment.
>
> In addition, inquiry is "talked about" at local, regional, and national conferences. For example, the technology "person" at the school is constantly sharing findings and learning from others utilizing technology around the country at national conferences ($8,000 to $10,000 is budgeted for this). To further enhance the capacity to discuss inquiry, the site is acquiring the technology that will enable videoconferencing, a sure-fire way to communicate with others at other sites. Publications also will continue to convey lessons learned as a direct consequence of inquiry.
>
> All of the "changes" at the PDS site have been promoted through the media and have served to promote a positive impression of the school. In a sense, this site has gone public, but teachers and administrators worry they still do not have the data they need, and fear positive publicity may contribute to a "halo effect." Thus, the Hawthorne Effect may occur—with the attention given to the site contributing more to the underlying cause of change, and not necessarily the kinds of inquiry and reflection about teaching and learning that are occurring.

The issues are clearly complex. One site hopes to look at the relationship among various parts of its preservice and intern programs, including the use of the pairing of interns with a single mentor teacher and the involvement of school-based faculty in undergraduate classes. Drawing connections between these rather complicated issues with specific student and adult learning is no simple matter.

Yet, there is no question that a few sites have made considerable progress relative to inquiry on teaching and learning. Where inquiry on is becoming more sophisticated, there are clear resources made available for such efforts. In one instance, such support would not exist without the specific infusion of dollars and expertise provided by a foundation.

However, we find little evidence of being able to move from the particular to the general. For example, one PDS site indeed has zoomed out and panned, as evidenced by a recently published paper on its effectiveness. The site is careful to note, on the other hand, that the primary goal of the inquiry on their PDS is to enable them to better understand the "whys and wherefores" of their school, and that may not be generalizable to other PDS sites. Given the design of their inquiry, this limitation is quite understandable and expected. Few connections are made with other PDSs or other settings that prepare new teachers and develop experienced ones.

Despite all the recent PDS activity across the nation, including those revealed in these selected surveys, not enough is known about PDSs and their effect on the teachers and students they serve.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

It is clear that the PDS sites described here are still struggling with inquiry. Although the respondents recognize the importance of inquiry driving practice across all three dimensions, there are few examples of well-defined inquiry practices. Much of what is happening remains relatively uncodified. While the PDS literature suggests considerable ambiguity as to the role, type, and effects of inquiry on teaching and learning practices as well as on teacher education reform, the NCATE survey has begun to specify some of the necessary features and how they play out in practice. We have found some rich examples of how these three different dimensions of inquiry can emerge and what may account for their convergence. The good news is that these school-university partnerships realize how important inquiry is to their long-term survival. We offer our concluding thoughts as a set of themes emerging from both the NCATE data and the literature.

Professional Development as Connecting Inquiry

It is important for professional development to be part and parcel of the inquiry process—no matter what dimension. We now know that more effective professional development must:

- be firmly anchored in concerns for specific student learning;
- recognize that developing the "right" dispositions may emerge only after engaging in the "right" practices (i.e., beliefs follow actions, not vice versa);
- allow for informed dissent among practitioners;
- be based on the best available research evidence on cognition, child development, and subject matter;
- connect teacher learning specifically with the teacher's work with students;
- provide for true collaboration between administrators and teachers in developing and sustaining the right mix of knowledge and skill development; and
- satisfy both the individual teacher's and the school's organizational needs (see Little, 1993; Lieberman, 1995b; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995).

To some extent, the sites reveal some evidence that the professional development unfolding in their PDSs possesses some of these characteristics. For example, one site defines professional development as the "desire to explore issues of practice to better understand how to approach or implement change" and is illustrated through collaboration among teachers and university faculty who co-author articles and co-present at conferences. In this site, it is more readily apparent that teachers, administrators, and teacher educators all are viewed as developing professionals. When inquiry works, it will be seen as a focused vehicle for professional development from implementation to assessment of efforts.

This, of course, is in contrast to the view, which surfaced in several surveys, that university faculty are at the zenith of the developmental process and that the school district continues to mandate staff development workshops which may be antithetical to the PDS inquiry agenda.

Making these connections between inquiry and professional development and other reform-related activities is critical. Without these connections, overload and fragmentation will continue undercutting PDS progress (see Fullan, 1993). Meier (1995) confronts us with a simple, yet powerful template to judge professional development in PDSs: schools which suggest learning at their core. She notes that:

> There are, in the end, only two main ways human beings learn: by observing others (directly or vicariously) and by trying things out for themselves. Novices learn from experts and experience. That's all there is to it. Everything else is in the details. Until we create schools in which the ratio of novices to experts is lower and the opportunities for novices to try out what they see and hear the experts doing are more plentiful, we will be wasting much of our time.... We also know that we don't learn from all experts.... Some we tune out.... How to create right conditions and provide the appropriate practice and feedback will require endless finagling and thus opportunities to make small and big mistakes (p. 181).

Only a few of the PDS sites seemed to have begun to make the connections between inquiry and professional development. The extent to which the PDS sites have created the organizational and cultural space for inquiry-driven professional development, as suggested by Meier, also is unclear.

Supporting and Transforming Beliefs Through Inquiry Actions

Even in PDSs that are developing a knowledge-based profession, conflicting views by participants and stakeholders sometimes can limit progress. In some instances, the sites reported problems associated with two common myths about teaching: "anybody can teach" and "good teachers are born, not made." These mythical beliefs can easily undercut PDS efforts; and they can be exacerbated by another damaging myth that "all students cannot learn rigorous content."

But more often than not, the inquiry process itself helped PDS educators confront and cope with their differing views in a productive and positive manner. For example, one site wrote about how there is a "growing belief that teachers are lifelong learners and that teaching is not telling," yet others "still hang onto old beliefs about teachers and learners." Sites like these are able to better manage the inherent conflict associated with change through inquiry itself. Inquiry can provide a safe context for looking and debating as well as thinking and acting differently. It appeared that those sites which embraced inquiry most consistently and cogently were more likely not to be "blocked" by alternative views of teaching and learning. In fact, alternative views can be (or must be) an engine of inquiry itself.

Most of the sites face the same barriers, including the problem of developing and acting on a shared belief system, especially as it regards who can learn and how they should go about their learning. But, sites can use these differences productively. In fact, these differences can define the use of inquiry in a transformative manner. For example, shared beliefs are not necessarily the ticket, but a willingness to engage in some degree of open confrontation about the participants' different beliefs is. Fullan (1993), in particular, points out that in any successful organizational change, problems are our friends because they are the nub of how we come up with creative solutions. Dealing with problems openly, questioning decisions and interpretations, and confronting conflict are the source of new insights. Having "no problems" may mean no meaningful change is being attempted.

Working on problems openly, but in a disciplined sort of way, may be a key to creating and sustaining inquiry. Yet, for school-based and university-based faculty to engage in such inquiry in a collaborative way will require a new organization and culture that only a few of the sites were just beginning to develop. These sites tended to be those that had been at their PDS work for a long time or that began their school as a PDS. Professional development schools require the "right stuff," but, having the "right stuff" may still be insufficient.

Inquiry Is More Than the Right Stuff...

Both the literature and the NCATE survey suggest some problems and cautions regarding the trappings of reform. For example, the survey responses can speak to reflective practice and inquiry-based teaching and learning. The PDS can have a focus on external curriculum standards for students and teachers alike. Indeed, there were some examples of how curriculum (e.g., NCTM), school reform (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools), or teacher education (INTASC) standards were used to promote a different way of thinking and acting on program quality and inquiry. Professional development initiatives can include participation in workshops, conferences, courses, committees, and shared teaching as well as teacher-research courses taught collaboratively by school-based and university-based. There can be specific efforts directed toward Holmes Partnership principles, and the site can utilize a governance council to collaboratively develop a school renewal plan. These were all important supports, but the site may appear to have "all the right stuff," and still run into difficulties.

The survey responses revealed, to a certain degree, that all the right stuff still may not be enough. In several cases, we found that important structural arrangements, such as a site-based governance committee, can focus primarily on the easy decisions (e.g., agenda, committee assignments, workshops, and due dates), not the hard ones. Scarce energy is spent on matters of little import. Consequently, college courses, cooperating teachers' roles, and student teacher expectations remain the same more often than not. In these instances, despite talk of teacher research and mini-grants, inquiry does not seem to surface in a substantive way, and it is rather clear that inquiry is not transforming practice. New organizational structures are necessary (although not necessarily sufficient) if PDSs are to become a sustained and powerful reality.

...But Without Some of the Right Stuff, Inquiry Will Continue To Be Limited

We found numerous examples where powerful organizational variables, such as school-based faculty actually controlling student intern experiences and instructional time, can make a significant difference in promoting inquiry and the ongoing development of the PDS.

The sites reported a litany of constraints related to inquiry—revolving around the more typical issues of insufficient rewards and time as well as bureaucracy and the budget. Indeed, few sites had significant dollars supporting their efforts. However, it seemed even when these constraints were present, supports such as mini-grants and stipends, peer visitation, teachers working with the same students for two to three years at a time, and real mentoring time for teacher education students could create a more positive ethos which, in turn, seemed to outweigh the constraints. New roles for school-based faculty as part-time facilitators of inquiry, with one foot in the classroom door and another in the world of brokering new ideas and actions among adults, were important. For practicing educators, leaving a classroom totally limits both legitimacy and the opportunity to make strong connections between theory and practice. Perhaps, with changing roles of school-based and university-based faculty also come changes in the quantity and quality of inquiry as well as increased dissemination of results of inquiry through writing and conference presentations. (Our further investigations must get a better handle on these issues and possibilities.)

Despite all the cultural capital of inquiry-based teaching and learning, many sites seem to confront—and not easily cope with—a number of deadening constraints. These include such issues as the local school board limiting teacher time away from the classroom, the job of teaching defined not by reflective action but by mandated curricular cookbook recipes, and the perception of unequal distribution of who (administrators, teachers, professors, politicians) has the most important or "right" knowledge.

With these difficulties in mind, we offer the particular thoughts of one practitioner who teaches at a nine-year-old PDS.

> Having just spent three hours today at our PDS team's regular three-hour research meeting (that happens every three weeks during the school day while our interns teach our classes), I've been thinking about the importance of inquiry, and also of the importance of time, commitment, and collaboration of college and school faculty in this whole operation. This is the first year that this group has met formally to discuss their individual research. The meeting took place, as it always does, in the elementary school library. The meeting today was chaired, as it always is, by the same college faculty member. This professor's role is to move the meeting forward, interject new ideas and theories. But it is the teachers who present their work at the meeting. It is their individual inquiries that are shared and hashed out by the others. This is a meeting of eight school faculty members and the interns' supervisor (who is also a full-time college professor). Three school faculty members present their research at each meeting. School and college faculty respond to the presentations. It is important to state how valuable these meetings are, and how they directly affect our teaching. I can certainly see room for improvement in these meetings. We need to be hearing about the college faculty members' research agendas, and I see this coming next year.
>
> These meetings could never have happened in our first year as a collaborative. But the seeds were there then. There was time. There was discussion. There was a shared vision and the determination that school and college faculty would enter the conversation at exactly the same level. I worry that this vision is not shared by school and university people in many sites.
>
> It is important to state right out that this PDS is nine years old, and it has taken a very long time to get to the point where we are today. Significant amounts of PDS time have been allocated for the purpose of professional growth from the very beginning of the collaborative, and I believe that this time has been central to the success of the inquiry that occurs in our collaborative.

Because of limited research in the past on the work and progress of both the lab and portal schools, it is critical that these particular PDS efforts contribute to the development of theory in teacher education and school reform. For these methodological as well as political breakthroughs to take place, PDS inquiry must focus on efforts related to enhancing student learning and the relationship between educator and student learning. As Teitel (1996) is quick to point out, there are "very few evaluations of PDSs in the literature." This must change, with more systemic inquiry that can go public. However, we insist that standards for inquiry must be upheld, avoiding the overly romantic notion that anything can go for inquiry in a PDS. We argue that as conversations develop over defining standards for PDSs themselves, then clear expectations for what counts as inquiry must be articulated. As the profession itself gropes toward a more defined view of research and a knowledge base for effective practice, so must PDSs explicate the implications of using inquiry as a means to transform day-to-day teaching and learning practices, engage in collaborative inquiry in order to determine what works best (or doesn't) for students, and conduct inquiry on the effects of the PDS on teaching and learning. Not to take such steps will do the profession a grave injustice, especially in terms of all the students who must be served better.

REFERENCES

Ancess, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1994a). The senior project. Authentic assessment at Hodgson Vocational/Technical High School. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Ancess, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1994b). Authentic teaching, learning, and assessment with new English learners at International High School. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Assessing accelerated schools: A toolkit for Accelerated Schools' self assessment. (1996, winter). Accelerated Schools Project Newsletter, 5, 8-11, 14-17, 22.

Bensman, D. (1994). Lives of the graduates of Central Park East Elementary School. Where have they gone? What did they really learn? New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Berry, B., & Catoe, S. (1994). Creating professional development schools: Policy and practice in South Carolina's PDS initiatives. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. (pp. 179–205). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R., Kaucheak, D., Crow, N., Hobbs, S., & Stokes, D. (1996, April). Teacher and school change in professional development schools: A cross case analysis of seven elementary and secondary school programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York.

Case, C.W., Norlander, K. A., & Reagan, T. (1993). Cultural transformations in the urban professional development school: Policy implications for school-university collaboration. Educational Policy, 7 (1) 40-60.

Corrigan, D. (1992, Spring). Reflections on thirty years of building collaborative efforts. Teaching Education, 4, 53-68.

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. (1995, April). Policies that support professional development: In an era of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 597-604.

Falk, B. (1994). The Bronx New School: Weaving assessment into the fabric of teaching and learning. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces. London: Falmer Press.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Ishler, R., & Edens, K. (1995). Professional development schools: What are they? Washington, DC: Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Levin, H. (1996). Accelerated visions. Accelerated Schools Project Newsletter, 5 (1), 2-3.

Lieberman, A. (1995a). Central Park East Secondary School guide. New York: NCREST (Teachers College, Columbia University).

Lieberman, A. (1995b, April). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 591-596.

Little, J.W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15 (2): 129-151.

Meier, D. (1995). The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem. Boston: Beacon Press.

NCREST (1994). Authentic teaching and assessment: Policy and practice: Examples from the field. New York: Author.

Osguthorpe, R. T., Harris, C., Harris, M., & Black, S. (1995). Partner schools: Centers for educational renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Page, F.A., & Page, J.A. (1981). The development of research as a role in laboratory schools. Farmville, VA: National Center of Laboratory Schools (ERIC Document Reproductions Service ED 212 628).

Schaefer, R.J. (1967). The school as a center of inquiry. New York: Harper and Row.

Sirotnik, K. (1987). The school as the center of change. Seattle: Center for Educational Renewal.

Sirotnik, K. (1988). The meaning and conduct of inquiry in school-university partnerships. In Sirotnik, K. & Goodlad, J. (Eds.), School-University Partnerships in Action. New York: Teachers College Press.

Snyder, J., Chittenden, E., & Ellington, P. (1993). Assessment of children's reading: A comparison of sources of evidence. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Snyder, J., Lieberman, A., Macdonald, M. B., & Goodwin, A. L. (1992). Makers of meaning in a learning-centered school. A case study of Central Park East 1 Elementary School. New York: NCREST, Teachers College.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. Educational Policy, 7 (1), 5-23.

Stallings, J., & Kowalski, T. (1990). Research on professional development schools. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development schools: A literature review. Washington, DC: Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Trachtman, R. (1996). The NCATE professional development school study. Washington, DC: NCATE.

Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T., & O'Keefe, P. (1992, January-February). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 3-18.

Wiseman, D. (1993, April). Inquiry process in the Texas A&M-Jane Long Middle School partnership. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia.

Financing Professional Development Schools

Richard W. Clark

Many educators and policymakers from different states report their preference for professional development schools (PDSs) for the practice phases of preservice teacher education. Although some states are considering requiring all preservice trainees to participate in a PDS as part of their preparation for their teaching license, Minnesota has passed legislation requiring all new teachers to begin their careers in such settings. In 1996, there were more than 600 institutions calling themselves "professional development schools" (or a related name, such as partner school, professional development center, or clinical school). By 1998, the National Network for Educational Renewal listed 500 institutions in its directory which does not include the hundreds which are part of other groups such as The Holmes Partnership. These are schools at widely different stages of development and, in many instances, have operationalized the concept in different ways. Such schools exist as part of state and local systems of education and are subject to the decisions of many people when it comes to determining their role, how they should operate, and how they should be financed.

The people whose decisions establish the direction of and provide resources to professional development schools include elected state officials and their staffs, university regents, state and local school board members, members of higher education commissions and state standards boards, chief executive officers of school districts and universities, members of faculty senates, and union leaders. The purpose of this paper is to support and inform all stakeholders who make decisions regarding the finances of professional development schools. The focus of the paper is on the portion of teacher education (preservice and inservice) that occurs in PDSs. Although important and in need of attention, this paper does not examine university-based components of teacher education.

As one observer commented, perhaps because writing about PDSs has outstripped development of them, there is much confusion regarding terminology. For our purposes, terms are defined as follows:

- Students are those young people enrolled in pre-kindergarten through grade 12 (P-12) schools.
- Teachers are educators employed by school districts (teachers, counselors, librarians, etc.).
- Professors are employed by institutions of higher education.

This chapter is an adaptation of, "Professional Development Schools: Policy and Financing. A Guide for Policymakers," by Richard W. Clark which was previously published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1997.

- Teacher education students are persons enrolled in teacher-preparation programs, including preservice candidates and interns who already have received their initial teaching licenses.
- Reflective inquiry and reflective practice exist when teachers who have a sound knowledge base in the art and science of teaching think about what they are doing as they are doing it.

BENEFITS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

The current model of teacher education and school reform has contributed to a system that is disjointed and confused. It makes sense, therefore, to develop a new system that will lead to improved P-16 learning. The PDS system has inherent benefits because it integrates the use of resources, focuses on core practices of teaching and learning, provides for quality control, contains within it accountability mechanisms, and offers provisions for reflective inquiry.

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) reports that between 1991-92 and 1995-96 the total number of PDSs increased from 123 to 637. During this time of rapid expansion, considerable differences existed in these schools, and data are only beginning to be available concerning the results obtained by PDSs. Still, there is increasing evidence that when PDSs are competently implemented they make a real difference for children in the schools and teacher education students alike.

In the PDSs formed to date, operating costs for teacher education generally are paid by the university. Professional development and inquiry costs are shared by the schools and the university, and the costs associated with student learning are paid for by the local school district. Start-up costs often are obtained from private or public grants.

The National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) recently convened a group of professors, state department of education officials, and school administrators to study the benefits of PDSs. These people, all of whom have extensive experience with such schools, met and identified the benefits they have seen. Their initial list was then circulated to educators associated with 34 institutions of higher education nationwide. These educators identified several research studies that support the assertions of the study group. (A number of these studies are included in the reference list at the end of this paper. See Abdal-Haqq, 1998, for weighing of evidence related to PDSs.) The studies did not produce evidence that contradicted any of the claimed benefits, although several affirmed, as the study group already knew, that hard, empirical data regarding direct benefits to students and teacher education students are still in short supply.

All things being equal, people who work extensively with PDSs believe that:

- P-12 students enrolled in professional development schools perform better than other students on common measures of student learning in basic subjects, such as language arts and mathematics.
- Teachers prepared in professional development schools are better able to elicit student learning than those assigned to traditional forms of internships.
- Teachers prepared in professional development schools are more familiar with the practices required in today's schools than those who obtain clinical experiences in other ways.
- Professional development conducted by professional development schools is more closely integrated with preservice education (and vice versa).
- Teachers perceive that professional development obtained through a PDS is more valuable than that obtained in traditional ways.
- Administrators report that they prefer to hire teachers who received their clinical training at a professional development school.
- Teacher associations believe that professional development schools contribute to the enhancement of the profession.
- Universities benefit from teachers who are trained in professional development schools because such teachers help prepare students to perform more successfully at the university level.
- Universities benefit from professional development schools because they generate tuition and fees in connection with the preservice and professional development course work completed in the PDS.
- Local school districts benefit from professional development schools because they reduce recruiting costs, retraining costs, legal fees (better teachers mean fewer costs incurred in firing teachers), and professional development needs.
- Local school districts benefit from professional development schools because they are useful sources of research information concerning the quality of new programs.
- Teachers working in PDSs are more apt to pursue graduate study to enhance their skills as teachers and mentors of teachers.
- P-12 students in PDSs have increased hours of adult attention in comparison to similar students in other schools.

- Teachers in PDSs exhibit more reflective practice than teachers in other schools.
- New teachers prepared through PDSs exhibit more reflective practice than teachers prepared via other kinds of clinical experiences.
- New teachers prepared through PDSs assume leadership roles among their peers more quickly than teachers prepared in other ways.
- Universities typically view themselves as having a substantial responsibility to the community. Service to P-12 schools discharges part of such responsibility.
- Better teachers make better schools. PDSs help business secure better workers because the students in the schools are better educated as a result of having teachers who were prepared in professional development schools.

APPROACHES TO FINANCING

To quote one observer, "The idea behind professional development schools and the rhetoric for them initially receive strong support from both the university and the school district. The problems come during implementation, when the realities of shared resources, changed relationships, and territorial issues dominate the discussion" (Wilson, in press).

The problems that arise from the sharing of resources reflect the usual conflicts within schools and universities regarding which efforts are going to receive priority when limited funding is available. However, the sharing of resources entails two complex bureaucracies adjusting to each other's way of budgeting, spending, and accounting for funds. Details of how public school teachers should be paid when they teach university students or what reimbursements should be made to professors for expenses related to their work with the school are examples of such concerns.

The lack of a clear message from the policy community regarding the school's responsibility for teacher education and the university's responsibility related to the education of P-12 students also may contribute to these problems.

Successful professional development schools make use of one or more of the following four approaches to financing their operation:

Approach 1: Eliminate old programs and implement new ones. PDSs affiliated with the University of Connecticut, the University of Louisville, and Brigham Young University are among those that have successfully sunsetted old programs and redirected money to PDSs. Places that try to run traditional programs as well as PDSs find it difficult to fund the new program.

Approach 2: Collaboratively commit to shared funding from K-12 and higher education. The University of Southern Maine and the Gorham, Maine, schools, the University of New Mexico and the Albuquerque schools, and the University of Hawaii and the Department of Education in Hawaii are among the diverse locales where the K-12 system and a university share in the developmental and operational costs of PDSs. Without such sharing, the financial load is too heavy.

Approach 3: Obtain substantial external funding. Although this solution is not likely to work for extended operations of a PDS, it has proven helpful for many during a school's initial development. The University of Texas at El Paso has garnered funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and the Texas Education Agency. West Virginia University secured more than $3 million from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. The Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal, which includes six universities and seven school districts, secured major financial support from Eisenhower grants and state Goals 2000 funding.

Approach 4: Become entrepreneurial. Leaders in many successful settings combine the first three approaches and add creative twists of their own to discover sources of funding. For example, Northglenn High School, working with the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD), has obtained some of its school district's sabbatical funds. With support from the union and the district, it hired seven "interns" at reduced salary; acquired grant funding; obtained school district professional development funds; found ways to locate university courses on its campus; and placed one of its faculty members as a visiting scholar at the University. Goldrick Elementary in Denver, also working with UCD, has made use of interns and obtained Americorps funds to support some of the preservice candidates with whom it works.

Beginning on page 156, two models of PDSs are offered along with more detailed information regarding how they have financed their operations. These approaches to financing need to be backed by a supportive policy environment.

WHAT POLICIES ARE NEEDED?

In light of the foregoing benefits and problems, the following policy actions should be taken:

To ensure the establishment of professional development schools:

- State policymakers should adopt laws and regulations that require teacher education programs to include experiences in professional development schools. This may be done by attaching a requirement for such experiences to certification requirements, administrative approval of university programs, or both.

- State policymakers should adopt laws and regulations that identify teacher education and professional development as a basic responsibility of school districts and universities. This may be done by adopting requirements for collaborative planning, by indicating that a portion of the funding allocated to both kinds of institutions is to be spent on teacher education, and/or by establishing accreditation or program approval standards that must be satisfied by both kinds of institutions.

- Higher education policymakers should adopt policies that recognize the work of university professors in professional development schools as contributing toward meeting standards for promotion and tenure.

- State policymakers should consider adopting laws and regulations that encourage the placement of first-year teachers in PDSs. An improved process of entry into the profession could be developed by making beginning teachers part of a team that also includes master teachers and teacher education students.

To finance the development and operation of professional development schools:

- State policymakers need to allocate funds for the development of sufficient professional development schools to ensure that all new teachers can be served. A recent NNER study suggests that, in addition to funds otherwise available, approximately $50,000 per year will be needed by each PDS for a minimum of two years' developmental efforts (Table 1, p. 155, provides more information).

- State policymakers should make it clear that money allocated to school districts and universities is to be used to provide support to PDSs. In some states this may require additional funds; in others, it may mean providing direction on how existing funding is to be used. In general, once PDSs have been initiated, it should be possible to operate them for approximately the same amount as is currently spent by schools and universities on teacher education and professional development, educational inquiry, and renewal of P-12 education.

- School district and university policymakers need to allocate funds to ensure sufficient time for collaborative planning by key individuals involved, representing both partners in the PDS. This may take the form of extended contracts and/or provision of additional staffing that will allow planning to be incorporated into the daily work of the participants.

START-UP AND OPERATING COSTS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Earlier we suggested four general approaches to funding PDSs. Here are more details concerning start-up and operating costs. Our review of reports of start-up costs suggests that a typical expenditure of $50,000 might be distributed as illustrated in the sample cost analysis in Table 1.

TABLE 1[1]
START-UP COSTS FOR A TYPICAL ELEMENTARY PDS

Coordination of Project	
Equivalent of cost of 1/4 time staff member shared by the university and the school	$10,000
Planning	
Workshops/Meetings	11,500
Visits to PDSs	5,000
Reading Materials	1,000
Consultants	4,000
Technology	
Computer Set-ups/Phone	10,000
Furnishings	
Desks and Tables, e.g.	3,000
Legal Reviews	500
Space (Capital)	5,000
TOTAL:	**$50,000**

Of course, in an ideal situation, such expenditures would be shared equally between school and university partners. However, our data suggest that universities, helped by grants from private and public agencies, have been the primary source of start-up costs. Since there has also been a tendency to emphasize the preservice function of PDSs, this tendency toward university financing is not surprising. Many professional development schools have obtained small grants to assist with start-up costs. Such grants have ranged from a few dollars to the $3.4 million received by West Virginia University from the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.

---

[1] Based on a survey of 18 PDSs found primarily within the National Network of Educational Renewal (NNER), an educational reform initiative embracing school-university partnerships in 14 states.

In the first model that follows, we have shown the start-up costs equally divided because the model reflects a commitment 1) to provide an exemplary education for P-12 students, 2) to provide a clinical setting for preservice education, 3) to provide professional development for teachers and professors, and 4) to promote and conduct inquiry that advances knowledge of schooling.

To demonstrate the way costs may be distributed in a typical PDS, we have examined the data from 18 elementary schools within the National Network for Educational Renewal (an educational reform initiative embracing school-university partnerships in 14 states) and prepared two reasonable models, which should provide a starting point for people who are dealing with issues related to financing their own professional development schools.

Each model consists of a short description of the characteristics of the PDS and a table identifying major costs.

MODEL 1: NOBLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND HARMONY UNIVERSITY

Noble Elementary School enrolls 500 elementary students in kindergarten through grade five. Twenty general classrooms are used for these students, with special needs students served mostly in general classrooms.

Harmony University prepares students to teach with a four-year undergraduate preservice program. Frequently, students take more than four years to complete the program because they are required to pursue an academic major outside of education, as well as their professional education sequence for certification.

Of the professional credits required for undergraduates to receive teacher certification when they earn their B.A., 45 semester hours are completed at Noble. At any given time in the PDS, 20 preservice students are participating for two semesters in methods/theory/lab blocks. Thirty semester hours are devoted to this activity by each student. There are also 10 students per semester (20 per year) in student teaching internships at the school. Each student earns 15 credit hours for student teaching. Thus, during the year there are always 30 students at Noble. These students generate 900 semester hours of university credit for the year.[2]

---

[2] The 18 elementary schools whose data we examined tended to be smaller than Noble because a number of those who shared information with us were from rural areas. The number of preservice teachers interacting with a school during a semester ranged from 4 to 350. There were two which reported regular participation by approximately 30 students.

Staff Development

Ongoing workshops are offered for cooperating teachers. Six full days during the year are allocated as professional development time for 20 teachers at Noble. Several of the "regular" teachers are not active participants in the PDS work, but they are replaced by several special needs teachers.

A seminar on the "Teacher as Researcher" is conducted at the school. Six faculty members meet with a university professor twice a month for three hours each session.

A variety of staff development workshops are offered (sometimes in conjunction with preservice methods/theory courses) at which attention is given to matters such as cooperative learning, student assessment, and uses of technology. In addition to the preservice courses, there is always one additional workshop, lasting about five weeks, which involves four to five teachers from the PDS and 15 from other schools in Noble's district.

During the summer, 10 Noble staff members work for 10 days with assistance from university faculty on summer curriculum development. Also during the summer, faculty from Noble work with a Harmony professor to provide leadership for summer inquiry projects conducted by teachers from other elementary schools in their district.

Within the school this year, university faculty are conducting two research projects on elementary student learning and teacher education student learning.

While the district continues to emphasize school-based renewal, Noble faculty provide support and facilitation that links renewal activities in other schools with those in their PDS.

Four university faculty members participate in three selected study sessions with faculty from Noble and other schools in the district during the year. The first examines issues related to tracking and grouping practices; the second focuses on issues related to inclusion of special needs students in regular classrooms; and the third redefines methods course instruction so it is of increased effectiveness for preservice and inservice teachers.

The following table reports costs of the activities described above.

TABLE 2
COSTS FOR NOBLE ELEMENTARY AND HARMONY UNIVERSITY

Cost Item	Paid by School District	Paid by University
1. Preservice FTE[a]		
Regular Faculty		$46,000 (1.0 FTE)
Adjunct/Clinical/ Coordinator	$23,000 (.5 FTE)	
Stipends/Awards (20 @ $400/student)	$8,000	
Clerical	$2,250 (.15 FTE)	
Related Activities		
Travel	$150	$300
Cohort Team-Building (w/ faculty)	$200	$800
Admissions to PDS	N/A	N/A
2. Prof. Development/ Inquiry/Renewal		
Adjunct Faculty/Clinical/ Coordinator	$23,000 (.5 FTE)	
Other Staff Costs/ Released Time[b]	$6,000	
Stipends[c]	$6,900 (Leader) $23,000 (Summer)	$7,900 (Leader)
3. General & Indirect Costs		
Classroom Space[d]	N/A	N/A
Supplies	$2,000	$2,000
Travel	$4,000	$1,000
Technology	$1,500	$5,000
School District Administrative Costs	$5,300	
Secretarial Support	$2,250 (.15 FTE)	
University Administrative Costs		$3,590
Program Evaluation[e]	$500	$2,500
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	**$108,050**	**$69,090**
Reimbursement Due School District[f]	**[$33,600]**	**$33,600**

TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

COSTS FOR NOBLE ELEMENTARY AND HARMONY UNIVERSITY

Cost Item	Paid by School District	Paid by University
Costs to Institutions for Years 3+[g] (Year One and Year Two include $50,000 start-up cost/year—see page 155)	$74,450	$102,690

NOTES TO TABLE 2:

a. Assume salary compensations of:

Regular Faculty = $46,000/year

Adjunct/Clinical/Coordinator = $46,000/year

Clerical/Secretarial = $15,000/year

b. Release of teachers for participation is made through: (a) replacement by teacher education students; (b) work done during summer; (c) work done at end or beginning of school day; and (d) replacement by substitutes (substitute rates = $100/day).

c. Stipend calculations (per diem set at .005):

(1) District Leadership: one person for 10 days curriculum leadership, 10 days workshop; five people participate for two days each for inquiry leadership (total = 30 days @ $230/day).

(2) University Leadership: one person for 10 days curriculum, 20 days inquiry; plus two research grants of $500 each for university researchers (Total =30 days x $230/day + $1,000 grants).

(3) Summer Institute (see page 157): 10 people x 10 days @ $230/day.

d. Assume that at least one room is devoted to preservice and other PDS activities. It may be necessary to add capital costs associated with providing portable or other added classroom space. Some classroom expense is provided for under capital start-up costs in Table 1, page 155.

e. Program evaluation addresses progress being made with regard to all four commitments of the PDS (see page 156). This includes assessment of student progress in elementary school and preservice and inservice program. Work would be shared with other PDSs in same school-university partnership.

f. $33,600 in school expenditures are reimbursed to the school district by the university. Other costs relate to activities and are paid for out of operating budgets of paying institutions, unless otherwise noted. Some costs may be supported by grants.

g. As explained on pages 154-155, it is assumed that there will be $50,000 in start-up costs per year for two consecutive years. This table reflects expected expenditures in year three, year four, etc., excluding start-up costs. Start-up activities are not one-time expenditures. For example, there is a need for ongoing conversations about mission and for continuous re-examination of programs and procedures.

Many of the PDSs reporting to us realize that there is a need for an ongoing examination of the purpose and work of the school. This is most evident in looking at ongoing costs of staff development, but to some extent it is the reason such schools need commitments of extensive amounts of time for school and university faculty. Like most operations in education, PDSs are labor-intensive institutions. Thus, whether one looks at preservice or other functions, labor costs represent the largest ingredient.

Harmony University spends approximately $103,000 a year for the equivalent of 30 full-time students. This represents a cost to the university of $3,433 per student. No tuition is realized from staff development courses.

The next model differs from the first in that it more closely represents an operating PDS arrangement and represents a program in which most preservice education is concentrated in a single post-graduate year.

MODEL 2: BAY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHERN STATE UNIVERSITY

Bay is a school district with 163 educators serving approximately 2,000 students in kindergarten through grade 12 in its six schools. As such, it is similar to the average school district in the nation (Education Week, 1996).

Northern began developing its current teacher preparation program when one of its professors and the dean of the College of Education approached six local superintendents about the creation of a school-university partnership modeled after those described by John Goodlad in *A Place Called School* (1984). For several years thereafter, faculty at Northern and at schools in districts such as Bay participated in intensive and thoughtful dialogue about school renewal and the needs of the College of Education for reforming its efforts. Subsequently, the partners evolved a new teacher education program built on common understandings between school and university faculty members.

At the heart of Northern's efforts to prepare teachers is its field-based, fifth-year program. Students enrolled in this phase of the program earn 33 graduate credits. University officials note that this approach allows them to obtain higher tuition than if the students were undergraduates.

Northern's full teacher-training program also includes an 18-credit undergraduate minor and an M.Ed. completion phase—nine credits per year over two years after the portfolio review for admission. While the pre-certification fifth-year phase of the program uses a PDS as its main site, M.Ed. students complete their work in the schools in which they work as new teachers.

The four major components to the certification-year program occur primarily in a PDS. The first major component is admissions. Prospective students, all of whom must hold a bachelor's degree, are first screened via paper review by university faculty to verify basic eligibility. Then, a portfolio review committee of school and university faculty examines the candidate's prior studies and experiences working with children. Prospective students next have an opportunity to visit those schools in the Bay School District that serve as PDSs for the Northern program. These orientation sessions provide a basis for the students to decide in which setting they will seek placement. Candidates are then interviewed by a team of two school and one university faculty. Those who indicate that Bay is a site they want to be considered for are interviewed by two educators from that school district along with the university faculty member who serves as the site leader. The final step in this phase is the placement process in which decisions are made that balance assignments among the different PDSs while honoring feedback from the interview teams and requests of the candidates.

The second component of Northern and Bay's effort is identified as "team building." University and school faculty working with Bay have selected an Outward Bound experience for their teacher education students. During the two- to three-day program, students and teachers develop self-confidence, establish reliance on each other, and begin to build themes for their work during the year. Various team-building activities, from rope courses to problem-solving simulations, are included. In addition to facilitation, travel, and housing costs associated with this experience, these efforts at team building are enhanced by attention to small details, such as the purchase of T-shirts for members of the Bay cohort.

Curriculum and instruction constitute the third component of Northern and Bay's work. Seven methods courses, totaling 21 credits, provide the background in pedagogy for the prospective teachers. Six of the courses focus on teaching mathematics, social studies, science, technology, and literacy (two courses comprise the literacy concentration—one in reading and one in writing). The seventh course focuses on human development. For Northern, the schedule varies somewhat depending on the PDS. At Bay, and in most instances, the course work begins in August and ends in February. For the most part, the courses are taught at a Bay school by university faculty. A course leader from the Bay faculty sets up actual field assignments.

The internship is the second part of the curriculum and instruction component. It includes a year-long seminar for which students receive three credits in the fall and three credits in the spring. Additionally, students receive six credits for the 15-week internship they finish in the spring. Mentor teachers are assigned to the students at the beginning of the year and are compensated by Northern for work done throughout the year.

The fourth component of the program is the portfolio evaluation process. The mentor teacher and the university- and school-based site supervisors work with the student throughout the year to develop the portfolio. In the spring, the teacher education students make a public presentation of their work. They present their portfolios to their mentors and supervisors and to an outside person, such as Northern's dean, one of Bay's principals, or the district superintendent. Northern and Bay faculty recognize that this activity is a program-selling event as well as an evaluative one.

During the course of one year, 15 interns are assigned to a Bay PDS for 33 credit hours each. Additionally, 15 undergraduate teacher education students also are assigned to a Bay PDS for one semester, each earning three credit hours. Thus, 540 total hours of credit are earned per year, 495 of which are graduate credits.

Bay serves as a professional development site as well as a location for clinical experiences for teacher education students.

Professional Development/Inquiry/School Renewal

Bay teachers take courses alongside teacher education students in such subjects as math, science, and literacy. The Bay district pays the teachers' tuition to attend these courses. The university thus receives tuition for the equivalent of five full-time students from this source, generating 150 credit hours. Considerable efforts also are made to assist teachers through the promotion of networking within schools and across schools within the school-university partnership in which Northern and Bay participate. The partnership also conducts conferences for teachers in the area—more than 500 educators engage annually in the discussions of different approaches to assessing student learning.

Work by school and university faculty to develop inquiry and research skills also aids in their professional growth. Bay and other PDSs associated with Northern are investigating using portfolios as a basis for certification. Work includes having Bay teachers actively participate in defining the parameters and requirements for preservice portfolios, including evaluating different approaches such as using videotape or digitized portfolios. Teachers put together their own portfolios to help teacher candidates decide what should be in theirs.

Also, through the partnership between Northern and the school district, mini-grants are awarded to teachers to promote experimentation with new and innovative approaches to classroom assessment.

School renewal activities feature schools seeking to concentrate on learner-centered practice. One approach to this has been through promotion within the school-university partnership of the School Quality Review process. This process, based on concepts developed in another state and Great Britain, engages teachers throughout Bay School District, including some who are not particularly involved in preservice teacher education.

As another approach to school renewal, Bay faculty choose annual themes. With faculty from Northern University, they then build special courses and seminars around these themes for interns and cooperating teachers—e.g., on teacher portfolios, or on integrated learning and articulation across grade levels.

TABLE 3

COSTS FOR BAY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHERN UNIVERSITY PDS

Cost Item	Paid by School District	Paid by University
1. Preservice FTE		
Regular Faculty	$34,500 (.75 FTE)	$65,320 (1.42 FTE)
Adjunct/Clinical/ Coordinator	$13,800 (.3 FTE)	$34,500 (.75 FTE)
Stipends/Awards	$6,345	$3,240
Clerical	$4,500 (.3 FTE)	$3,000 (.2 FTE)
Related Activities		
Travel		$3,500
Cohort Team-Building (w/ faculty)	N/A	N/A
Admissions to PDS	$3,450	$690
Assessment of Candidates	$4,260	$575
2. Prof. Development/ Inquiry/Renewal		
Regular Lead Faculty	$241,500 (5.25 FTE)	$3,680 (.08 FTE)
Adjunct Faculty/Clinical/ Coordinator	$360,640 (7.84 FTE)	$1,380 (.03 FTE)
Teacher Release Time (160 x $100/day)	$16,000	
Stipends for Workshop Seminars	$30,000	$1,150
Teacher as Researcher Activities	$12,300	
School Effectiveness Evaluation	$10,000	
Curriculum Development	$19,500	

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)
COSTS FOR BAY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND NORTHERN UNIVERSITY PDS

Cost Item	Paid by School District	Paid by University
3. General & Indirect Costs		
Supplies	$600	$600
Travel	$9,850	
Technology	$2,450	$2,500
School District Administrative Costs	$23,241	
University Administrative Costs		$4,307
Program Evaluation		$1,500
Ongoing Partnership Costs	$2,700	$12,000
TOTAL OPERATING COSTS	**$795,636**	**$137,942**
Reimbursement Due School District	**[$16,100]**[a]	**$16,100**
Costs to Institutions for Years 3+ (Year One and Year Two include $50,000 start-up cost/year—see page 155.)	**$779,536**[b]	**$154,042**

NOTES TO TABLE 3:

a. $16,100 in school expenditures are reimbursed to the school district by the university.

b. The real district used as primary reference point for Bay annually spends 45% of its district budget on staff development.

A wide variety of school renewal activities are facilitated by the school-university partnership in connection with various national reform movements, including Foxfire, Atlas, Coalition of Essential Schools, and the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST).

The university spends approximately $150,000 annually to provide 660 credit hours of instruction, most of which is postgraduate. This represents a cost of $6,819 per full-time equivalent student.

Table 3 reflects costs of a typical year at the Bay-Northern PDS, adjusted using assumed compensation rates that are the same as those used for the previous model.

COMPARATIVE COSTS OF USING AND NOT USING PDSs

The variance in costs of different teacher education and school renewal efforts is enormous. However, the data reviewed by the NNER study group confirm that, once start-up costs have been met, teacher education and school renewal functions at a PDS can be carried out within existing levels of school district and university expenditure. Because effective PDSs require thorough planning and coordination between universities and schools, several, including Theobald (1991), have suggested that costs may increase by as much as 10 percent. However, the most critical factors in determining relative costs between traditional programs and PDSs appear to be (a) whether the PDS is implemented in place of other efforts at teacher education and school renewal, and (b) whether the university and the school districts both invest in the effort and commit to it as a critical component in teacher education and school renewal.

REFERENCES AND RELATED PUBLICATIONS ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Anderson, R. C. (Ed.) (1993). Voices of change: A report of the clinical schools project. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Benedum Collaborative. (1996). Professional development schools teacher assessment study and its implications for school renewal. Unpublished Draft, West Virginia University, College of Human Resources and Education.

Blocker, S. & Mantle-Bromley, C. PDS vs. campus preparation: Through the eyes of the students. Unpublished manuscript.

Butler, J. C. (December 4, 1995). A special report on the West Virginia University Education Reform Project. Prepared for the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation.

Clark, R. W. (1995, Spring). Financing professional development schools. PDS Network News, 2, 1-4,7.

Clark, R. W. (1995). Partner schools. Seattle: Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington.

Clark, R. W. (1996, Summer). Professional development schools. Contemporary Education, 4.

Contemporary Education. (1996, Summer). Special issue: Professional development schools revisited. Terre Haute, IN: School of Education, Indiana State University.

Cooner, D. D., Hilgemeier, S., Couger, G., & Adoue, D. (1996). Texas A&M University final report. TEI project: Professional development school partnerships at Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas. College Station, TX: College of Education, Texas A&M University. (Unpublished--part of NEA's seven-site TEI Project which was ongoing as of the preparation of this pamphlet.)

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

District averages. Education Week, 10 January 1996, p. 4.

Frazier, C. M. (1993). A shared vision: Policy recommendations for linking teacher education to school reform. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Levine, M. (Ed.). (1992). Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform. New York: Teachers College Press. (See particularly Barbara Neufeld, "Professional Practice Schools in Context: New Mixtures of Institutional Authority.").

Levine, M. & Trachtman, R. (1997). Building professional development schools: Policy, politics, and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (September, 1996). What matters most: Teaching for America's future. New York: Author.

Osguthorpe, R. T., Harris, C. R., Fox Harris, M., & Black, S. (Eds.). (1995). Partner schools: Centers for educational renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Petrie, H. G. (1995). Professionalization, partnership and power: Building professional development schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Theobald, N. (1991, spring). Staffing, financing, and governing professional development schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13, 87-101.

University of North Florida, Clay and Duval County Public Schools. (June, 1996). Final report: Growing young minds, AT&T teachers for tomorrow program. Jacksonville, FL. (Unpublished report on file at AACTE).

Webb-Dempsey, J. (1996). Benedum collaborative professional development schools impact assessment study: Initial findings from student data collection pilot in the five original PDS sites. (Draft Report). West Virginia University, College of Human Resources and Education, The Center for Renewal of Professional Preparation and Practice.

Wilson, T. A. (in press). Accreditation, standards and school improvement. In Designing PDS standards that work. Washington, DC: NCATE.

About the Authors

Barnett Berry, Ph.D., currently serves as the Associate Director for Policy and State Relations for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, working with a wide range of stakeholders and constituents on both technical and policy development initiatives dedicated to dramatically enhancing the teacher profession. In addition, he works with a number of foundations and organizations dedicated to enhancing the teaching profession including the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Public School Forum of North Carolina, the A+ Research Foundation of Alabama, the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, Recruiting New Teachers, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Dr. Berry has taught social studies in an inner-city high school, served as a social scientist at RAND Corporation, served as a senior policy advisor at the South Carolina State Department of Education. He is the author or co-author of 70 monographs, book chapters, and journal articles.

Katherine Boles, Ed.D., co-teaches a fourth grade class with Vivian Troen at the Edward Devotion School, a public school in Brookline, Mass. In addition, she teaches new forms of teacher leadership at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Boles has been a classroom teacher for more than 20 years, and in that capacity she co-founded the Learning/Teaching Collaborative, a Professional Development School that links the public schools of Boston and Brookline with Wheelock College and Simmons College in Boston. Boles completed her doctorate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1991. Her thesis and subsequent articles and chapters have focused on teacher leadership and school restructuring initiated by teachers.

Mario R. Borunda, Ed.D., led the Graduate School at Wheelock College from 1989-1997 in an effort to diversify the Graduate School's knowledge base, programs, and community collaborations. These community collaborations included professional development school partnerships in Boston, Cambridge, and Brookline. These partnerships, along with others in the early childhood professional community, significantly contributed to the programmatic and curricular changes implemented during Dr. Borunda's tenure. Prior to becoming the Dean at Wheelock, Dr. Borunda's professional experiences included teaching and administering at several educational levels; ranging from first and second grades in Honolulu, Hawaii, to the second and fourth grades in predominately Mexican and Mexican-American neighborhoods of Los Angeles. While at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, he served as Chair of the Minority Advisory committee and Chair of the *Harvard Educational Review*. In addition, he co-founded the Center for Urban and Minority Education. He has continued to center his professional life on issues of race and racism in education.

Richard W. Clark, Ph.D., is a Senior Associate with the Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, University of Washington and a Senior Associate of the Seattle based Institute for Educational Inquiry. He works with the National Network for Educational Renewal to help obtain the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators. Dick Clark was a teacher and administrator with the Bellevue, Washington Public Schools for 30 years. He has worked as a consultant evaluating change in schools that are members of the Coalition of Essential Schools and evaluating reform in Philadelphia for The Pew Charitable Trusts. He has also taught in three universities, and worked nationally as a consultant in school-based management, teacher evaluation, and evaluation of various reform efforts. He has authored articles and book chapters on curriculum, professional development schools, school-university partnerships, educational finance, and program evaluation. His most recent book, with Pat Wasley and Robert Hampel, is *Kids and School Reform*, published in 1997 by Jossey-Bass. Clark's Ph.D. is from the University of Washington which recognized him in 1989 with its Distinguished Graduate Student Alum Award.

Kellah M. Edens, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of South Carolina (USC). A former public school art teacher, she has been involved with the USC PDS Initiative for the past seven years in several capacities, including conducting research on PDS teaching and learning practices.

Nancy J. Lauter, Ed.D., is Associate Professor in the Curriculum and Teaching Department at Montclair State University where she is a member of the Professional Development School Steering Committee. In her previous positions as Deputy Director of the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST) and Associate Dean for Curriculum Development at Wheelock College in Boston, Massachusetts; she played significant roles in developing partnerships and transforming teacher education curriculum. While at NCREST and Teachers College, she served as Co-director of the NCREST National PDS Network and Co-director of the Teachers College-Manhattan District Three-United Federation of Teachers Partnership. Dr. Lauter is the editor of a book of readings, *Child Development*, and author of several articles on early childhood practice.

Peter Murrell, Jr., Ph.D., is currently Associate Professor in the Departments of Education and Psychology at Northeastern University, where he is also the Director of the Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.) Program in the Center for Innovation in Urban Education (CIUE). He received his Ph.D. in Urban Education-Educational Psychology from the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, specializing in human learning and cognition. He earned his M.S. degree from the University of Wisconsin at Madison in Experimental Psychology specializing in cognition and learning, and his B.A. in Psychology from Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota. Dr. Murrell's research is in the area of human learning and cognition in cultural and community context. He is currently researching relationships between communities of practice in African-centered urban schools and the academic achievement of African American children.

Annalee Nissenhotz, Ph.D., earned her doctorate in education from Saint Louis University. She has worked in the field of education for 27 years in St. Louis, Missouri. Over these years, she has been a classroom teacher, taught undergraduate and graduate courses in education at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, and supervised student teachers. For 12 years she has been a guidance teacher for elementary, middle, and high schools.

Karen O'Connor has 23 years of professional experience in early childhood teaching and staff development. As Executive Director of a statewide teachers' center, the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, her work focuses on promoting and supporting the ongoing professional development of teacher leaders and designing opportunities for professional collaboration through conferences, institutes, publications, and teacher networks. Since 1988, she has co-facilitated the Center's Massachusetts Professional Development School Network. The Network is designed to advance research, evaluation and documentation of PDS partnerships; inform and influence local and state policy around pre-service education and professional development of K-sixteen educators; and enhance partnership development that will lead to improved teaching and learning in Massachusetts.

Charlotte Reed, Ed.D., is the Executive Director of the Urban Teacher Education Program and an Associate Professor in the Division of Education at Indiana University Northwest. Prior to this she was an Associate Professor of Education at Purdue University Calumet, a teacher educator at Alverno College in Milwaukee, a Project Director at the Race Desegregation Center at the University of Virginia, and an English teacher in the New York City Public Schools. She is the recipient of numerous awards and honors including Phi Delta Kappa for both outstanding research and distinguished service, and an Activism Award from the Women's Educators of the American Education Research Association. Her research and publication interests include: self-concept and achievement, equity issues, and multiculturalism as they relate to school improvement, urban education, and teacher preparation.

Jon Snyder, Ed.D., is currently the Director of Teacher Education and a faculty member in the Educational Leadership and Organizations specialization at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He is also a Senior Researcher and Policy Analyst for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. He began his career in education as an elementary school teacher and worked with first through sixth graders. He has also interned as an elementary school principal and served as a staff and curriculum developer. Immediately prior to his move to Santa Barbara, Dr. Snyder was the Associate Director of Research for the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching and worked in the teacher education program at Teachers College. Dr. Snyder serves on various commissions and task forces, and consults with several states engaged in developing standards and assessments for beginning teachers. He remains engaged in researching teacher learning and the conditions of learning for teachers.

Lee Teitel, Ed.D., has been active in understanding and promoting professional development school partnerships since 1989. His research interests include the start-up issues facing PDS partnerships, new leadership roles for teachers and principals created in PDSs, and the impact that involvement with PDS can have on the transformation of teacher education. He has given workshops and presentations at AACTE and AERA and written numerous articles and monographs on these topics, including a PDS literature review for the NCATE PDS Standards Project. He is currently involved in a multi-site study documenting the impact of PDS partnerships in Massachusetts. Dr. Teitel is active in promoting professional development school partnerships at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, where he is an Associate Professor. He has served on two steering committees promoting the PDS concept: a statewide one sponsored by the Massachusetts Field Center for Teaching and Learning, and another with a national focus at the National Center for Restructuring Education Schools and Teaching (NCREST).

Roberta Trachtman, Ed.D., is an education consultant whose work focuses on the connections between school reform and the preparation and growth of teachers and administrators. She conducts research for NCATE's project to develop and implement standards for professional development schools.

Vivian Troen is a teacher, leader, and advocate of the professionalization of teaching, and innovator in educational reform. She balances her commitment to teaching with a growing consulting practice which has carried her influence to a widening circle of people and issues on the leading edge of structural change in educational policy and institutions. She is co-founder, with colleague Dr. Katherine Boles, of the Learning/Teaching Collaborative, one of the first professional development schools in the country to link colleges and public schools in partnerships for preservice training of teachers.

Betty Lou Whitford, Ph.D., is Professor of Education at the University of Louisville. Her research and teaching are based on active involvement for over 25 years with education reform, especially school-university partnerships. Her recent research includes case studies of schoolwide restructuring and the links between school and teacher education reform. She is co-author of *Knitting It All Together: Collaborative Teacher Education in Southern Maine*, a monograph about the PDS program based at the University of Southern Maine, and co-editor of *Accountability, Assessment, and Teacher Commitment: Lessons from Kentucky's Reforms*, forthcoming from SUNY Press. She teaches doctoral research seminars, specializing in qualitative research, and co-directs the NCREST-sponsored Leading Edge PDS Project. She holds A.B., M.A.T., and Ph.D. degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Robert O. Williams, Ph.D., is Professor of Education and Director of the Professional Development Schools partnership at Indiana State University. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from Indiana State University (ISU) and his Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction from Southern Illinios University-Carbondale. His work focuses primarily on school curriculum development and change, teacher development, and school-university partnerships. He has served as the director of the ISU PDS partnership since its inception in 1992 and currently is also directing the newly established Office of Educational Outreach and Office of Educational Research and Evaluation at ISU.